BF
1261
T76

Turvey , Vincent N.

The Beginnings of Seership

DATE DUE

JAN 3 '78			
AUG 24 '73			
SEP 1 1 1980			
SEP 2 5 1987			
NOV 1 0			

UNITY SCHOOL LIBRARY
UNITY VILLAGE, MO. 64063

DEMCO

UNITY LIBRARY & ARCHIVES
The beginnings of seership : as
BF 1261 .T76
0 0051 0023099 7

THE BEGINNINGS OF SEERSHIP

OR

SUPER-NORMAL MENTAL ACTIVITY

THE BEGINNINGS OF SEERSHIP

OR

SUPER-NORMAL MENTAL ACTIVITY

BY

VINCENT N. TURVEY

PSYCHIC BOOK CLUB
48 Old Bailey, London, E.C.4

First Published 1911

This edition was published in 1954 by the Psychic Book Club as one of the outstanding psychic books selected for their members to whom it is issued exclusively at a privilege price.
Particulars of membership can be obtained from the Psychic Book Club, 48 Old Bailey, London, E.C.4.

Printed in Great Britain by
Lowe and Brydone (Printers) Limited, London, N.W.10

BF
1261
.T6

EDITOR'S FOREWORD TO THE ORIGINAL EDITION.

IF there is any value to be attached to this book it is chiefly due to the amount of evidence which I am able to produce in order to substantiate my statements. My thanks are therefore offered to all those witnesses who have kindly allowed me to print their letters and use their names.

I present the book to the public as one written by many authors, whose writings are merely tied together by "the man who did it," that is, by the Editor himself.

So far as is possible I refrain from offering any explanation of the *modus operandi*, for the excellent reason that I do not for certain know "how" or "why" I have done these things. Where, for instance, in the Introduction, I appear to offer a theory, I do not wish it to be taken as definitely established, and I mention it only because it more nearly describes my sensations, when functioning super-normally, than anything else of which I can think. We now know that the sun does not rise and set, but it *still appears* to do so. So, although my sensations may deceive me, nothing can alter the fact that what I say correctly describes "what *appears* to happen." I am compelled

to write even these tentative explanations in a somewhat definite manner, because, otherwise, there would be a tedious repetition of such phrases as "it appears to me," "I felt as if," etc., etc.

Ninety-five per cent. of my statements are borne out by the letters produced as evidence. The few that are not mentioned are omitted probably for one or more of the following reasons—

1. The haste in which the letter is written.
2. The inability of the writer to remember all the facts.
3. The writer may not have considered the subject "worth wasting much time on."

And for the same reasons the writers may have put some of the occurrences out of the order in which they actually took place. Few of them say, "I had not told you so-and-so," for they take it that so much is clearly understood; else there would be no need of the letter.

In one or two cases I have split the letter into two parts, in order that the testimony therein contained may come under its correct heading. For instance, I have a letter from the Hon. Mrs. H. Ellis vouching for a "spirit Visitant" and also for a fulfilled prophecy. In order to keep my experiences classified in groups, I have printed her letter in two parts, each under its own heading. In no case have I added or altered a word; and, in the case

of "extracts," that which is omitted has no bearing on the *facts*, and the extract is called an extract and not a letter.

All the names mentioned are those of real persons, living witnesses, actual writers of the letters. Where I have been unable to obtain permission to print the name in full I have been compelled to use initials only. When one remembers the torrents of abuse to which people who put their names to any "impossible" thing are subjected, one can only wonder that I have been able to obtain any full names at all; and even now, in order to protect my witnesses, I do not print their addresses.

I have, however, submitted the original letters and the type-written MS. to four gentlemen, who have kindly certified that the letters are genuine, and that the copies (for the printer) are correct. As these gentlemen are only concerned with checking the letters, and as their signing the Voucher in no way implies their belief in "spirits," I do hope that even the anonymous letter-writer will leave them alone, and, if he must write abuse, will write to me only.

Those among my readers who, for scientific or other sufficient reasons, cannot accept even the Voucher, and must themselves see the original letters, are at perfect liberty to do so. Thanks to the courtesy and kindness of The Editor of *Light*, I am able to refer *bonâ fide* researchers to him. He holds all the original letters, and, upon appointment made, will be

pleased to show them. I have decided to make a charge of one shilling for viewing the originals, and the proceeds will be handed to Dr. Barnardo's Home for Waifs and Strays.* This is done to save useless wear and tear of the letters at the hands of the merely idly curious.

I need hardly mention that I trust that any person who views the letters will not divulge more names or addresses than are already mentioned herein.

Some readers may possibly think I am too sensitive over the "abusive letter" question. Eight years ago a letter of mine was printed in the *Daily Mail*, and in it I mentioned that "I leave my body and travel to places I have never seen, and this I think is perhaps the reason that many people often *recognize* a place and seem to know it well, although they have not been there before."

A simple, inoffensive statement, and yet I was inundated with abusive letters and post-cards, mostly signed, "A lover of Jesus," "A follower of Christ," or "An upholder of God." Naturally I desire to protect my witnesses from similar attacks. Many other letters were received, and most of the writers received tests that satisfied them. In fact, indirectly, the whole of this book is due to that letter. For then it was that, in spite of my illness, which is still with me, I determined to collect a mass of evidence which would satisfy any unbiassed, fair-minded man that in the human mind there

* Or some other equally deserving charitable institution.

are gigantic possibilities which at present are largely unrecognized except by the student of occultism.

As I consider that I have now accomplished my self-imposed task, and have demonstrated that the claim I made to the possession of these faculties (*Daily Mail*, January 27, 1903) was not merely an idle boast, I no longer feel under any moral obligation to give further tests. I shall therefore refuse to comply with any requests which I may receive, after the publication of this book, for demonstrations of psychic faculties, for the following reasons, which I hope the reader will admit are only fair and rational—

1. Seeing that my gifts or faculties are not yet under my control, and that I cannot switch them on and off as I like, it would be impossible for me to make any appointment for the purpose of demonstration with any degree of certainty as to the production of the phenomena.

2. The mere fact of *knowing* that I *was* being tested would (almost) for certain kill all chances of success.

3. The anxiety to prove the truth of my statements would, alone, be sufficient to stop psychic action (for I am *not* protected by the trance condition), and the knowledge that if I failed I should be called a liar, and if I succeeded I should, in all probability, be called a

trickster, would be the *coup de grâce*. This would only be History repeating herself, for such has been the fate of nearly *every* psychic.

4. If I were to give an absolutely irrefutable test, "Ai registered at Lloyd's," to nine of the greatest sceptics alive, and were to print their letters as testimony, the tenth man—or his office-boy—would say: "Ah, yes! but they were a lot of fools! Now if you can only give *me* a test *I* will write you a letter, and *that* will convince everybody!" The credulity of the sceptic is marvellous. If he receives a convincing proof that the phenomena really *do* occur he hastens to impart the news to his late companions, and is actually surprised to find that they dare to imply that he is *non compos mentis*. It is most awfully funny to see the erstwhile Socrates called a deluded idiot by his former disciples, simply because he has *learned another fact*; and to note the fury with which he resents "the ignorant denials" which were once his own "magnificent arguments."

5. Whilst being willing to place at the disposal of any investigator facts which may be of use to him in his researches, I am not in the least *anxious* to convince sceptics. And although I am

only too pleased to do what I can to help a fellow truth-seeker, I most certainly do not intend to pander to what, in far too many cases, is a mere morbid mystery-mongering mania.

Few people can well realize what the production of this book has meant to me. The phenomena being *by far* the easiest part of the work.

The labour, the worry, the mental, physical, and psychical difficulties with which I have had to contend, to say nothing of the lack of sympathy and charitableness, have been almost more than I could stand. However, I have used my mental and spiritual forces to override my physical weaknesses, and shall consider that my reward is sufficient if this book be the means of bringing one soul to find peace and happiness in the assurance of an after-life. I shall indeed be glad if one sceptical doctor be, by my work, led to acknowledge that man *can* function at a distance from his body, that man *can* "see" that which is beyond the range of physical vision, and that perhaps the brain after all does *not* represent the thinking part of man, but is only the part which is thought through by the "real man" himself.

In using the word "Super-normal" in preference to the misleading words "miraculous" and "supernatural," I desire to be understood as using it in its accepted sense of to-day; for I fully realize that the super-normal of one generation or race will, in accordance with the

Law of Evolution, be the "normal" of future generations.

I hope that it is unnecessary for me to say that I in no way, either directly or indirectly, make money out of, or accept fees for, any little thing I may do for my fellow-man, by means of my super-normal mental action, or, as I prefer to call it, my Seership.

I take this opportunity of thanking Dr. Abraham Wallace, M.D., Messrs. W. T. Stead, J. W. Sharpe, M.A., J. J. Morse, E. W. Wallis, Dudley Wright, J. B. Shipley, F. J. Johnson, and others for their kind encouragement, and their appreciation of the MS. of this book.

VINCENT N. TURVEY.

September, 1909

VOUCHER.

We, the undersigned, have read the originals of the letters herein quoted and have checked the type-written MS. copies by them. In our opinion the letters are absolutely genuine correspondence given or sent to Mr. Turvey, as evidence for some super-normal faculty possessed by him.

We have seen a document signed by three officers of a public Society vouching for the Public Clairvoyance herein mentioned, and we have also seen the note-book kept by Mr. Turvey, wherein each separate public appearance is noted with the number of "descriptions" given, and each evening's record is signed for by two or more witnesses.

We think Mr. Turvey's state of health makes it impossible for him to have used any method of espionage, and we do not think he is morally capable of attempting to do so.

J. W. Sharpe, M.A., Woodroffe, Portarlington Road, Bournemouth.

G. Isaacs, B.A., Rosenheim, Branksome Park, Bournemouth.

Reginald B. Span.

E. R. Serocold Skeels, 55, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

(slightly abridged)

by WILLIAM T. STEAD

FEW little books have more profoundly affected the public mind of late than the volume entitled, "An Adventure," published by Messrs. Macmillan. In this book two ladies, for whose good faith the publishers vouch, describe in plain lucid English, with much matter-of-fact detail, how two ladies, all unsuspecting of any of the mysteries of astral or other planes, having gone in the ordinary humdrum tourist fashion to "Versailles," suddenly found themselves in the presence of Marie Antoinette and others, who with their attendants were occupying themselves very much as they might have been engaged more than a century since. The scenery, too, of the region into which they had strayed had undergone a change. The park had reverted to the state in which it was at the end of the eighteenth century. All this might be dismissed as merely a clairvoyant vision of the past had it not been that the two English ladies, who were not clairvoyant, and who were in their ordinary everyday condition, spoke to the people whom they met, never

suspecting that they were addressing mortals who had been dead and gone for a hundred years, and received from them audible answers in reply to their questions as to their way about the park. This intermingling of the past and the present, this superposition of the world of a hundred years ago upon the actual world of to-day, would in itself have called for no remark. Every object is a palimpsest upon which all past events are inscribed, the record of each successive generation being impressed upon the record of its predecessor. That of course. But the unusual, the inexplicable, feature of the Versailles story is that the people of the eighteenth century saw, heard, and spoke to the visitors of the twentieth century. This is no mere deciphering of the palimpsest of the past. It is a revelation, not merely of the possibility of walking right out of the century into another, but of interesting the old-time people in the trivial business of a century which did not begin until their own bodies had been dead and buried for a hundred years. Marie Antoinette not merely wore the veritable gown, the milliner's bill for which is still extant, but she saw, and her attendants addressed, two English ladies who were wandering through the park seeking their way to the Petit Trianon.

At the Pageant of London in the Crystal Palace the audience witnessed the gradual evolution of architecture, military and ecclesiastical. The Druids' circle is replaced by

the temple of Diana; the temple of Diana becomes a Christian church; the old cathedral of London gives place to the master-piece of Sir Christopher Wren. It is a triumph of the scene-shifter's art. The older buildings seem to disappear; but they are there, ready to reappear in due course at the next performance. There is the same kind of scene-shifting possible in nature. Hampton Court and the palaces at Versailles are capable of undergoing this occasional transformation by resurrection. It is a phenomenon not unknown even in private houses, when, on the occasion of some ghostly apparition, the walls, furniture and decoration of the room mysteriously revert to the "as you were" of the period to which the ghostly visitant belongs. All that is familiar to every one who has paid even a cursory attention to psychic phenomena. But the new, weird, original, and most puzzling thing in "An Adventure," is that the people of the twentieth century not merely saw, not merely heard the voices of the far-away people of the eighteenth century, but were able to ask them the way about the park, and to obtain from them information, which, although it did not exceed the content of the knowledge they possessed in the time of Marie Antoinette, was supplied on demand to meet the needs of subjects of Edward VII.

The interest aroused by "An Adventure" is much wider than that which is elicited by the ordinary reports of psychical researchers. The

very normal matter-of-factness of the adventure is challenging to the ordinary mind. It provokes inquiry, and opens up vast new vistas. If it stood alone it might be dismissed; but it does not stand alone.

The *Occult Review* for April (1911) printed a delightful story—for the accuracy of which its lady correspondent vouches—of the living presence of Queen Katherine at Hampton Court. It is an exact parallel to the story of Marie Antoinette at Versailles. The correspondent wished to visit the chapel at Hampton Court, but was refused access by the officials—

"On leaving the palace, instead of going straight out, I turned to the right, where there is a dark, damp, semi-cloister passage, in the centre of which there is a door of entrance into the chapel. I paused before it a moment, thinking, 'how ridiculous it seems not to be allowed to go in here like everywhere else!' and then passed on to the end of the passage, where on the left-hand side a square covered place opens out. There, in the left-hand corner, I saw a figure standing, which I mentally identified as Queen Katherine Howard; she was dressed in a long heavy black velvet dress, with a sort of white coif on her head and falling over her shoulders. Her features were blurred and misty, but she made me a most graceful and courteous bow, and seemed to say to me, 'You want to see the inside of the chapel? So you shall, and I will tell you how to do so'; then, pointing down another

passage, she added, 'Go to the end there and turn the corner, and you will find a man sweeping; ask him, and he will tell you how to get in.' She then made another graceful wave with her right hand; and thanking her with a bow I went in the direction indicated, where sure enough I did find a man sweeping up all the débris of the passage.''

This man directed her to a little house, where she found an old man, who, on being told what she wanted, replied—

''Come along, then,'' and led me back to the door in the passage where I had stood before; but the figure of the queen was no longer where she had been, when we passed the square covered place. She had vanished —but the old man began talking about her, and said, 'Queen Katherine is often about here, but we take no notice of her, she does us no harm.' He let me then into the chapel.''

The distinctive feature of both stories is the same, but the Hampton Court story carries it a step further than ''An Adventure.'' For the correspondent of the *Occult Review* did not merely obtain information which was within the content of Queen Katherine's mind in the sixteenth century, but received from the apparition of Queen Katherine up-to-date information, which enabled the visitor to whom she imparted it to obtain admission to the chapel of to-day. In the ''Versailles'' adventure there is no indication that Marie Antoinette, or her attendants, were cognizant of the changes which

had taken place since their day. The information imparted related to the old Versailles; but in the *Occult Review* story Queen Katherine directed the visitor how to obtain admission to the existing Chapel, by applying to persons who were certainly not alive in the reign, or in the time, of Henry VIII.

The challenging mystery of these phenomena provokes investigation into the nature of the faculties which enabled these phenomena to be observed and described. Hence I venture to think that this work on the "Beginnings of Seership" may be studied with something of the attention which it deserves. Mr. Turvey, like all the rest of us, has his own theories and hypotheses as to the how and the why. He may be right, or he may be wrong. We are not concerned with his theories and explanations. The facts which he records are the important thing.

The distinctive feature of his book is that there is hardly one narrative which is not vouched for by independent witnesses, whose written statements I have seen, and whose testimony is still available. It is not as if these eye-witnesses were called upon, after a long lapse of time, to revive memories of a distant past with the aid of leading questions by a zealous counsel. Their letters were written at the time that the incidents occurred, and they are printed as they were written. The originals can be inspected by all who are concerned in the serious investigation of the

subject, among whom, of course, I do not include the professional *advocatus diaboli* of the S.P.R., whose zeal in the discovery of fraud and falsehood has quite eaten him up.

I have been asked to write a preface to this collection of facts, and I do it with the greatest pleasure. I know the author well. He is a gentleman of good standing and of independent means. Although he has long been an invalid, the clearness of his mind and the acuteness of his intelligence have never been impaired by the severity of the sufferings which have racked his physical frame. I do not think that he is capable of stating anything that is false, especially on a subject like this.

Mr. Turvey is in no sense of the word a professional medium. He has placed his time and his services at the disposal of investigators without fee or reward. He frankly confesses that he is unaware of the extent or of the limits of his own powers. He expressly repudiates any claim to be able to exercise his peculiar gift at any moment under any conditions. Often, when he wants them most, he can command them least. He is and always has been an investigator, feeling his way like a blind man with a stick through a crowded street. If he has arrived at certain conclusions which appear to him to fit the facts, he is, nevertheless, quite ready to abandon them to-morrow, if any one can suggest a better working hypothesis to account for what has happened. He makes no claim to be able to

do anything for anybody. He has done, seen, and heard certain things, some of which are in this book faithfully recorded. But he does not pretend to be able to do similar things all over again, whenever he wants to, for any friend or stranger, who demands "first-hand evidence."

Mr. Turvey discovered what he called "Phone-voyance" in 1905. But its exercise was intermittent and fitful.

Even if we admit that all those who rang up Mr. Turvey, in a casual manner, *subconsciously* telepathed the descriptions to him; that would not cover all the facts, as Mr. Turvey sometimes described things which were unknown to the person who rang him up, and the descriptions had to be verified later on.

Mr. Turvey, it will be noted, frankly expresses his belief in the existence of "spirits," with whom the "spirit" that is in each of us can on occasion enter into communication. That fact will, of course, be used to discredit his testimony, especially by those who have gone crazy over the telepathic hypothesis. But, as Dr. Hyslop recently remarked in the Proceedings of the American Psychical Research Society, the hypothesis of "spirit" intercourse is quite as respectable as that of telepathy, and is much more scientific.

"To make such suppositions as the average telepathic devotee makes is a travesty of everything that we can regard as scientifically sane or legitimate. Telepathy explains nothing, and is serviceable only for fooling sceptics and

stupid prejudices. Spirits are as admissible possibilities as telepathy even is as a fact, and a hundredfold more explanatory, so that from the scientific side of the question they are preferable."

But no one is obliged to assent to, or dissent from, Mr. Turvey's hypothesis. What we have to do with is Mr. Turvey's narrative of facts. If we cannot explain it away, or disprove it, or invalidate its accuracy in any way, what are we going to do about it? How can we account for these things? If on the accepted orthodox dogmas of materialistic science they cannot be accounted for, then the time has come to recognize that these dogmas want readjusting, so as to account for the facts.

An unexplained, and apparently inexplicable fact often contains within itself the key to a new truth. What is the truth to which "phonevoyance" is the key?

That is a question not to be discussed in a preface, which is an introduction to the book, and not a solution of its problems. If the reader be convinced by reading the book that these events, visions, previsions, etc., actually did happen as vouched for, then the question arises whether the faculties of Mr. Turvey are peculiar to Mr. Turvey, or whether he has but stumbled upon a fact which suggests that such faculties are inherent, but latent, in the whole human race. This brings us up to the question, who is Mr. Turvey? Upon this point,

as I have already implied, I am in a position to speak with the authority belonging to one who bears testimony to the character and identity of a friend, whom one has known for many years.

Mr. Turvey is a real man, and no myth. He lives at a seaside watering-place, in a villa pleasantly placed in the midst of a large garden surrounded by pine woods. He pays rates and taxes like an ordinary mortal, sends his children to school, and provides for the expenses of his household in the ordinary way of ordinary men. In personal appearance he is a man like other men, bearing indeed an almost uncanny resemblance to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, of whom he appears to be a miniature edition. There is nothing to differentiate him from the other well-to-do British citizens in the midst of whom he lives and moves and has his being. Nevertheless, to this individual, an apparently average specimen of the human race, there have occurred the experiences which are set forth, with definite precision and minute detail, in the chapters of this book. These experiences certainly suggest the possession by the author of faculties that, as yet, have not been evolved in the rest of mankind.

There seems little in his personal history to indicate why he more than others should have this abnormal mentality. He is a Lancashire man, born in Southport on February 11, 1873, at 7-45 p.m., a fact which astrologers will be glad to have. As a child he was delicate; and,

like many other children before the darkness of our prison house descends upon them, he was accustomed to see forms moving around him, which grown-ups declared did not exist. His last experience of that kind in childhood was a vision which he had of his father. Vincent Turvey was singing in church as a choir boy, when he suddenly saw the apparition of his father. Some weeks afterwards he was told that his father had died at the very time, and at a place 300 miles away. Vincent was ten years old when, for some years, the visionary faculty left him. In 1883 he was sent to school in Bedfordshire. He was a wiry, athletic, school boy, with the temperament of quicksilver, and a physique as tough and as spare as a wire nail.

In 1890 he left school, and studied engineering with a view to entering the navy. During the next five years he worked hard at his profession, but he toiled still harder as a cyclist. He was "cycle-mad"—crazy for breaking records. As a member of the North Road Club he entered for fifty-mile road races, and very nearly succeeded in breaking the record. To ride from London to York in twenty hours was mere pastime. He was a light weight, full of nerve, and with a passion for speed. In 1895 he passed one of his examinations for the navy; but, for family reasons, he did not take up a profession in which, to judge from the high character of his certificates, he would probably have risen to distinction. In 1902

his health broke down completely. Since then it has been a marvel that he has survived. Speaking of his illness he said to me once, "The fact that I am alive, is to me, and to those doctors and friends who know my case, nothing short of a miracle. To mention one illness, pyo-pneumothorax (in layman's language, the lung burst like a bicycle tire and displaced the heart), is sufficient to make ordinary people 'quit the body,' but I have had many other illnesses besides that. My case will appear in a great physician's book as a leading instance of the possibility of an almost impossible recovery." Mr. Turvey is now recovering his health to a certain extent; and he says, "No one would believe what I have been through." Many times he has been given up; but he declares that "some one inside me always said, 'Not yet, my boy'," or words to that effect. On one occasion a doctor said, "Send for his friends, he will not see tea-time." Mr. Turvey opened his eyes and said, "Bet you I play croquet in four months." And in four months he could have done so, with an effort, had there been the need.

In spite of his illness Mr. Turvey has produced this book; and few can know what it has cost him to do so. He says, "I felt I had done nothing for humanity. I felt that my gifts, which returned during my illness, should at least be tabulated and evidenced, in the hope that, by the record of what I have seen, some fellow-man might be convinced that there

is no death. If only *one* soul be convinced by my book, that will be enough payment for me for anything I may have suffered in order to demonstrate and tabulate the phenomena which I have experienced.''

For about eight years he has lived practically alone in his garden, in a tent, and has spent about ten or twelve hours a day either reading, writing, talking to inquirers, or meditating upon occult things. He says, ''After forty thousand hours on one topic, I think I can claim to be, in a *small* way, a yogi. My illness and my meditation have produced, or awakened, my psychic gifts; and all the Yoga, Vedic and Gnostic teachings which I *now* read (and much more besides) seem to be familiar to me. I seem to have evolved them in my own mind, during meditation from a sort of 'memory.' In fact I often pitch a book away and say, 'Why, I know all this'; and yet I had *not* read it before. Many Eastern 'forms' come and argue with me, and of course I learn from them; but they do not come to teach as a guru would. They come 'to help you to teach yourself in this present life.' In a word, I am 'Self-taught'; but I owe a great deal to Eastern 'forms,' many of whom visit me, and give tests of their identity by talking to me in their *own* languages; and I get the messages translated. My unpublished experiences in cross correspondence, etc., are to me even more convincing that those in this book; but they are not so easily tabulated or evidenced.''

It was after his worst illness that the gift of seeing and hearing things, invisible and inaudible to others, came back to him. This would seem to indicate that the rough wall of matter which had been built up around the finer senses of the soul had been pierced by the disease that had prostrated his physical strength. Whether Mr. Turvey would have possessed his super-normal gifts if he had enjoyed normal health is a question to which even Mr. Turvey can give no positive reply. If the malady be the price of the gifts, there will be few who will purchase the use of these faculties at so great a cost. But it is possible that, if Mr. Turvey had voluntarily adopted the habits of contemplation and study to which he has been involuntarily subjected by his ill-health, he would have attained the same results, especially as he was born with psychic gifts.

Whether this be so or not, there can be no doubt that Mr. Turvey has acquired a remarkable capacity for controlling his super-normal faculties. He says—

"I never bother about 'conditions'; a church or a hotel is all the same to me so far as 'seeing' is concerned. I 'see' best for strangers; my friends get nothing."

His training as an engineer has made him methodical and exact; and the severe discipline of prolonged ill-health has subdued the vehement impulsive nature which he formerly possessed.

There is nothing in all this to suggest the

existence of anything very abnormal in Mr. Turvey. He is an ordinary, quick-witted, business man, who has had the advantage of his engineering training, and the disadvantage of very bad health. He does not regard himself as a medium. He is never entranced, and has never been controlled, although his astral seems sometimes to have controlled other people.

But, though Mr. Turvey may be only an ordinary man, yet the beginning of seership in him may foreshadow great things for the future development, or disinterring, of similar faculties in mankind in general. What Mr. Turvey calls the beginnings others would consider to be, very nearly, if not quite, the advanced stages of seership. Mental-body travelling and prophecy have been called "the hall mark of an adept"; and St. Paul says of spiritual gifts, "the greatest of these is prophecy." It would be interesting to know what Mr. Turvey would consider to be the acme of seership. He says it is "God-consciousness," "the Realization of Deity," or "Attainment of the Self." In the process of evolution man has lost many faculties which he formerly possessed. The human body is a veritable cemetery of muscles and organs that have perished by disuse. It is at least conceivable that, as man loses old faculties, he may evolve new ones. If he has lost the quick scent of the hound, and the balancing faculty of his simian ancestors, he may be capable of developing the faculty of far-seeing, or through-

seeing, possibly even that of foreseeing. By the agency of a wire and a cell he can hear the voice of his fellow across a thousand miles. Marconi has shown us that we can dispense with the wire. Who knows whether we may not some day dispense with the cell?

The discovery of radium, which revolutionized in an hour the fundamental principles of material science, may have its counterpart in the discoveries which are yet to be made within the dim and comparatively unexplored hinterland of the human consciousness. All students agree that there are almost illimitable potentialities in the human ego. There may be a whole new continent within ourselves waiting for the advent of some new Columbus to make its treasures available, and to reveal its wonders. The value of this book is that it affords well-attested evidence as to the existence of certain faculties in a certain living and accessible human being, the use of which the average man has not yet mastered. It may be that these faculties are peculiar to this particular unit of the genus *homo*. If this be the case, he is at least as worthy of serious scientific examination as any other *lusus naturae*. Imagine the sensation that would be occasioned at the British Association if a descendant of the ancient Cyclops were produced, with a single eye in the centre of his forehead! It would be more apt an illustration to suppose the discovery of a man who had developed a third eye at the back of his head. The

occurrence of a third eye in a single individual would be held to suggest that there was a latent potentiality for the developing of a third eye in other men. Here is Mr. Turvey, who has either developed or inherited (or perhaps he has done both), a faculty of sight far more marvellous than that which would be acquired by the man with a third eye in the back of his head. The evidence of the accuracy of his statements is accessible to any serious student who, not deeming "The Voucher" sufficient guarantee of the existence and genuineness of the letters, cares to write to Mr. Turvey for any particular "letter."

It may be said that the third-eye man would have his eye continually on show, and that this circumstance differentiates it from the faculties of Mr. Turvey, which are more or less fitful in their apparition. But a comet is not held to be less worthy of the scrutiny of the astronomer than the planet or the fixed star; rather otherwise. For that which exists, but whose existence is only manifested fitfully or occasionally, demands much more vigilance and alertness on the part of the observer than that which is fixed and permanent.

Mr. Turvey's own account of the way in which he exercises his abnormal mentality is very interesting, and sometimes illuminating. Take for instance his description of how he sometimes sees his visions of things to come. He says—

"At certain times I see a sort of film or ribbon

continually moving, as does an endless belt in a cinematograph film. This film is in colour of a very, very pale pinky-heliotrope, and it seems to vibrate with very great velocity. Upon it are numerous little pictures, some of which appear to be engraved on the film itself, whilst others are like pale blue photographs stuck on to the film. The former I have found to refer to past events, the latter to those about to happen. The locality of the event is judged by the scenery and the climatic heat. I have to estimate dates by the clearness of the pictures."

Again he says: "I foresee more unpleasant than pleasant things. I believe the reason to be that evil, being near to matter than to spirit, is more ponderous in the ether than its opposite, and is therefore sensed more easily by a Seer. I not only see, but feel, the density of evil."

His description of his sensations, when seeing through the telephone, is not less precise. He says—

"In most cases I seem to 'see' through a halo, or aura, of bright heliotrope, or pale violet-coloured fire, the flashes or sparks of which do not appear to cover *all* the window, so to speak, but to leave the centre clear and colourless; and in that centre there appears the person or object that is 'seen.' Another extraordinary phase, which I call *genuine* phone-voyance, consists in this, that a part of my mentality seems to ooze out of me along the line for a little distance, say for a yard or two;

and as 'I' go, so little pieces of the copper wire that lay together, as A——B, seem to turn over into B——A, *i.e.*, to reverse their relative positions, these pieces appearing to be about four inches in length.''

The reference in the foregoing sentence to ''I'' needs an explanation, which Mr. Turvey gives as follows:—

''In order to avoid such a phrase as, 'My spirit went to London while I remained in Bournemouth,' I use 'I,' in inverted commas, to denote that part of my consciousness, or 'being,' which appears to function at a distance from my body, and use 'Me,' with a capital M and inverted commas, to denote the body which remains at home, and which is apparently fully conscious, normal, and in no way entranced.''

The phenomenon of mental-body-travelling is familiar to many; but I do not remember ever having seen the process explained so clearly as in the following passage:—

''In the mental-body-travelling the 'I' appears to leave the 'Me,' and to fly through space at a velocity that renders the view of the country passed over very indistinct and blurred. The 'I' appears to be about two miles above the earth, and can only barely distinguish water from land, or forest from city; and only then, if the tracts perceived be fairly large in area. Small rivers or villages would not be distinguishable.''

Mr. Turvey is able to produce actual physical

effects with his mental body, but only when he is able to draw energy from some physical body in the room. He says—

"When, besides hearing—or seeing—with the 'mental' body—'I' also moves matter, then 'I' makes use of a medium's 'psychic force,' which 'I' appears to draw from the medium's wrists or knees as a sort of red sticky matter (a part of his 'energy' or 'vitality' body?). At any rate, that is what appeared to happen when on one occasion 'I' lifted a bed with two people in it, and spoke to them in the 'direct' voice. Physically I have not strength in myself to raise a small child."

The people in bed were four miles away from Mr. Turvey's physical body.

Equally interesting and suggestive is Mr. Turvey's account of ordinary long-distance clairvoyance. He says—

"In plain, long-distance, clairvoyance I appear to see through a tunnel which is cut through all intervening physical objects, such as towns, forests and mountains. This tunnel seems to terminate just inside Mr. Brown's study, for instance; but I can *only* see what is actually *there*, and am not able to walk about the house, nor to use any other faculty but that of sight. In fact, it is almost like extended physical sight on a flat earth void of obstacles. (This tunnel also applies to *time* as well as to *space*.)"

In mental-body-travelling the "I" is actually on the spot, and sees, and hears, and

smells, and uses all the senses of the "Me" which remains at home; although, if physical force be needed, this is as a rule borrowed from a third party.

The most suggestive hint afforded us by Mr. Turvey is in the following passage, where he speaks of the living cord which keeps the "I" in communication with the "Me." It has frequently been described by people who have left their bodies, apparently at the point of death, but who have afterwards been brought back to life. Mr. Turvey says—

"This cord appears whenever the 'I' leaves the 'Me.' It seems to join one body to the other, passing from the solar plexus of the one to the back of the neck of the other. It is very like a spider's cord; but in colour it is silver, tinged with heliotrope; and it extends itself and contracts in the same way as does elastic cord."

It is by the same cord that he effects phone-voyance, as when he says—

"Sometimes 'I' appears to be in the room at the one end of the line, and, by a sort of living cord, to communicate with 'Me' at the other end, and to make 'Me' speak about what 'I' sees."

It is worth noting that Mr. Turvey finds "*genuine*" phone-voyance (when the "I" appears to go inside the wires) a much greater strain on the brain than ordinary clairvoyance or astral voyaging.

I have perhaps trespassed too long on the

patience of the reader. But before I close I wish to emphasize one or two points. First, that Mr. Turvey is so scrupulous on the subject of the acceptance of money in connection with the exercise of his psychic gifts, that he has made over to me all his copyright in this book, which is published at his own expense.

Secondly, that I suppress his address only because I do not think that he should be subjected to personal visits from intruders, who merely wish to gratify their own idle curiosity.

Thirdly, that I repeat once more that I believe Mr. Turvey is a man of truth, that his testimony is trustworthy evidence as to what is within his own knowledge, and that the witnesses' letters which are held for the scrutiny of inquirers are the genuine epistles of credible witnesses.

Therefore, I give this little book my blessing and send it out into the world to provoke discussion, and to stimulate thought, as to the vast latent potentialities of men.

W. T. STEAD.

May, 1911.

AN APPRECIATION:
by SIR ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE

6 Clarence Parade
Southsea.
Sept 1

My dear Mr Blake

Many thanks for the book which I will soon return. It is most excellent and clearer than any description of occult gifts that I have ever read. I wonder if I could call and see Mr. Tuvey when I am at Bournemouth.

Yours very sincerely

A Conan Doyle

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER		PAGE
	EDITOR'S FOREWORD	7
	VOUCHER	15
	PREFACE BY W. T. STEAD	17
	SIR A. CONAN DOYLE'S LETTER	39
	INTRODUCTION	43
I.	ORDINARY CLAIRVOYANCE	57
II.	PUBLIC CLAIRVOYANCE	79
III.	"SPIRIT" VISITANTS	93
IV.	LONG-DISTANCE CLAIRVOYANCE	111
V.	PHONE-VOYANCE	122
VI.	PROPHECIES	139
VII.	FUNCTIONING IN THE "MENTAL BODY"	157

INTRODUCTION
TO THE FIRST EDITION.

In laying the following incidents of my Seership before my reader, I have, after careful consideration, decided to make use of the usual Spiritualistic phraseology; because, even if it be not all that could be desired, it is simple and easily understood.

Professor Huxley said that it is inadvisable to coin new words to take the place of old ones, for, even if they be more scientific, the old ones at least have the merit of existence. It is, in my opinion, a great pity that words such as "Telekinesis" and "Parakinesis" should have been coined to take the place of "movement without contact" and "movement with contact." If this pseudo-scientific, Graeco-Roman jargon in any way explained things I would say by all means use it; but it does not. In fact, nearly all that it does do is to make a few people appear to be learned and to render confusion more confounded. For years the plough-boy has been pawning his watch, and scientists (with a few grand exceptions) have been denying that there is such a thing as a real watch, and have called the plough-boy a fraud, and his witnesses a lot of deluded lunatics. The plough-boy kept on pawning

his watch for all that. At last Science made a discovery. She found out that the Juvenile Agriculturalist hypothecated his chronometer! All of which is, of course, highly satisfactory, and very explanatory.

But in the event of any new phase of mediumship, or seership, being developed, it may be advisable to coin a simple and easily understood word to denote that phase. To having done this I plead guilty. I have coined the word "Phone-voyance" to denote a phase in my seership that may *possibly* be new to Modern Spiritualism. This phase is the possession of the ability at times to give Clairvoyance through, or when using, the telephone. The word "Phone-voyance" implies four things. Firstly, that there is a demonstration of *psychic* vision; secondly, that there is *physical* contact; thirdly, that this contact is by means of the national telephone wires and instruments; and fourthly, that the Clairvoyance is simultaneous with the physical contact. I do not use the word "Telesthesia" for several reasons. Firstly, it conveys no meaning to very many people; secondly, it was coined to replace "long-distance Clairvoyance," and also "Spirit-body-travelling," words which have the merit of existence and simplicity; thirdly, it does not make a distinction between long-distance Clairvoyance, "Mental-body-travelling," or Phone-voyance, probably because the man who coined it was *not* a clairvoyant, and did not know from personal

experience that there *is* a difference, which I hope to point out later on; and, lastly, and most particularly, the word "Telesthesia" in *no way* implies either *physical* contact or the means of physical contact, as does Phone-voyance. Granting that it is applicable to long-distance Clairvoyance and also to Mental-body-travelling, in neither of which there is any physical contact, it certainly cannot apply to Phone-voyance; for even if the telephone be *not* actually seen through, and I do not assert that it is, it is at least in actual use so far as contact, voice, and ear are concerned. Therefore, with all due deference to my critics, I shall use the word "Phone-voyance" when otherwise it would be necessary to say "whilst conversing with Mr. Jones, through the telephone installation for the conveyance of sound between two or more given points connected by that system, I made use of Telesthesia in order to perceive that he was a tall, dark man, and conveyed that information to him by means of the instrument installed in my hall, *viâ* the Exchange, and he, by means of a similar instrument affixed to the writing-table in his study, was enabled to hear what I said and to reply that my statement was correct."

Probably the above method would be more in accordance with the desires of a few; but it would be *rather* tedious to most people.

I must also plead guilty to using a somewhat unorthodox mode of speech, to treating the

pronouns rather disrespectfully, and to the frequent though unavoidable use of them.

In order to avoid using such a phrase as "My spirit went to London while I remained in Bournemouth," which is a somewhat too definite statement, and also makes the "spirit" which is the *real* "I," appear to be secondary to the body—I have decided to use "I" in inverted commas to denote that part of my consciousness, or "being," which appears to function at a distance from the body, and to use "Me" with a capital M and in inverted commas to denote the body which remains at home, and is apparently fully conscious, normal, and in no way entranced.

Thus "'I' went to Mr. Brown's house in Bedford, and 'Me' described to Mr. Jones what 'I' saw there," may be taken to mean that, while Mr. Jones was talking to me in my house at Bournemouth, a part of my consciousness seemed to be able to function in Mr. Brown's house at Bedford, and in some way or other I was able to tell Mr. Jones what Mr. Brown was doing, at the same time as that part of my consciousness was, in some partially embodied form, apparently walking about Mr. Brown's house.

At the time of writing, that is to say, so far as I have developed as a seer, the differences which I experience between the three phases of Clairvoyance are as follows:—

In plain, long-distance Clairvoyance I appear to see through a tunnel which is cut through

all intervening physical objects, such as towns, forests and mountains. This tunnel seems to terminate just inside Mr. Brown's study, for instance, and I can *only* see what is actually *there*, and am not able to walk about the house, or use any other faculty but that of sight. In fact, it is almost like extended physical sight on a flat earth void of obstacles. (This tunnel also applies to *time* as well as to *space*.)

In Mental-body-travelling the "I" appears to leave the "Me," and to fly through space at a velocity which renders the view of the country over which "I" pass very indistinct and blurred. The "I" appears to be about two miles above the earth, and can only barely distinguish water from land, or forest from city; and only then if the tracts perceived be fairly large in area. Small rivers or villages would not be distinguishable. When "I" arrive at, say Mr. Brown's house in Bedford, "I" am not only able to see into one room, but am able to walk about the house, see the contents of various rooms and boxes, touch the curtain, and *feel* that it is made of velvet, move a table or bed, smell an escape of gas, diagnose a disease, look into the "surroundings" of Mr. Brown, and, in a few cases, "I" have been visible. "I" also hear parts of conversations; and, on several occasions, "I" have controlled a medium, and introduced myself through his organism to people present, and have carried on a conversation with them.

When, in addition to hearing and seeing, with the "mental" body, "I" also move matter, "I" seem to make use of the medium's "psychic force," which "I" appears to draw from his wrists or knees as a sort of red sticky matter (part of his "energy" or "vitality" body?). At any rate, that is what appeared to happen when on one occasion "I" lifted a bed with two people in it,* and spoke to one of them in the "direct" voice. Physically I dare not attempt to lift a small child, for I have not the strength to do it.

In Phone-voyance there seems to be a marked difference from both these forms of Clairvoyance—in fact, several differences.

Firstly, there is a physical connection with the place or house "at a distance"; secondly, I can talk through the telephone to the man "at a distance"; thirdly, the description is given *to* the person "at a distance." Whereas, of course, in long-distance Clairvoyance and Mental-body-travelling none of these things apply.

I mention this because it is a point which makes the so-called explanation, "Telepathy," more difficult to accept than it would be if the man were actually in the room *with* me.

And, further, the reader will notice that I often describe that which the listener at the

* I have a letter from one of the individuals who was in the bed and who heard me speak in the "direct" voice; but I do not print the letter, as it was not checked by the signatories of the Voucher, and therefore cannot honestly be included in this book.

other end of the telephone wire *does* not know, *i.e.* for instance, what "his daughter was doing in the room above him," and "a book held by another person *behind* him," etc., thus putting "Telepathy" still further out of court.

Now, as to my sensations when using Phone-voyance. These are sometimes one thing and sometimes another. But in most cases I seem to "see" through a halo, or aura, of bright heliotrope, or pale violet-coloured fire, the flashes or sparks of which do not appear to cover *all* the window, so to speak, but to leave the centre clear and colourless, and in that centre appears the person or object that is "seen."

Another extraordinary thing is that occasionally a part of my mentality seems to ooze out of me, and to run along the line for a little distance, say a yard or two; and as "I" go, so little pieces of the copper wire which lay together, A——B, seem to turn over to B——A, *i.e.* to reverse their position as if on a hinge. These pieces appear to be about four inches in length.

At other times Phone-voyance seems to be very like Mental-body-travelling, because "I" appears to be in the room at the one end of the line, and, by a sort of living cord,* to communicate with "Me" at the other end, and

* This cord appears whenever the "I" leaves the "Me." It seems to join one body to the other from the solar plexus to the back of the neck. It is very like a spider's cord; but in colour it is silver tinged with heliotrope, and it extends and contracts in the same way as does elastic cord.

to make "Me" speak about that which "I" sees.

I first became aware of the faculty of Phone-voyance in the year 1905 It was a phenomenon about which I had never even dreamed, much less expected to witness. The letters produced in Chapter V. show by the dates thereof that I have used the faculty intermittently for a period of three years, *i.e.* from 1905 to 1908. However, as I find that Phone-voyance is a great strain on the brain, and as I believe that its too frequent use would lead to *very serious injury*, I have made it a fixed rule never to try experiments for the merely idly curious, and only to use the faculty when it comes of its own accord, so to speak. I think the evidence produced in Chapter V. is sufficient to prove that the faculty *exists*, and that proof is the object which I had in view whilst accumulating the evidence.

Now, not only is the manner, or method, of "seeing" different from that of long-distance Clairvoyance, but the things seen are not so limited nor so restricted; for not only do I "see" what is actually *there*, but I also see things "habitually worn" by my listener, or by his friend in the room, although they be *not there* with him at the time. Then, again, I see people in the room above my listener—"spirits" known to the listener—and "spirits" known to the man in the room with him, but not known to himself. And, lastly, I have seen a picture of a young lady known to the listener, but who was miles away from him; and I was able to

say that she was not dead and yet not actually with him in the physical body.

In passing, I may add that so far as I have experimented with Phone-voyance, all my attempts have been more or less successful. This, however, I leave my readers to judge for themselves. I shall only say that I have laid the whole series before them, and *not* merely the selected few. In fact, this statement applies practically to the whole of this book. The signed evidence which I possess shows that out of one hundred and sixty descriptions given in public one hundred and forty-four were recognized as correct; that out of (about) three hundred in private 96 per cent. were correct; and that of prophecies thirty out of thirty-seven were fufilled. I do not produce all the evidence which I possess, because of the similarity of the incidents to those already chronicled.

Many of the phenomena herein mentioned have nothing to do with the so-called dead; and where I *do* talk of "spirits" I do so simply because it is a word already in existence; but, of course, the reader who does not believe in "spirits" can use any other word that he likes —"astrals," "thought-forms," "hallucinations," "devils dressed up," "telepathic pictures sent from one sub-conscious mind to another," "delusions," "shades," etc., etc., all of which are, doubtless, very lucid "explanations."

I merely present this book as evidence of a super-normal mental faculty; and I do so in

the hope that it may induce some competent authority to investigate these powers of the mind of man, which are usually latent in most people.

There are many faults and weaknesses in this treatise; but I console myself with the thoughts that few men can make a perfect thing, and that nothing will please *everybody*. Much of the evidence produced may be considered weak, and capable of being upset, etc., etc.: of this I am quite aware; but, at the same time, I would point out that the "Clairvoyance" and the written testimony were things of *spontaneous birth*. By that I mean that nothing was deliberately planned or mapped out, as, for instance, would be a Cycling Tournament, and the registering of "Records." Ordinary every-day sort of people —if they will pardon the phrase—came to see me in order to talk about psychic phenomena, and if any tests or descriptions were given, they, in some cases, wrote a letter in an honest, plain, straightforward manner, stating what had occurred. The very weakness of one or two letters is, in my opinion, my strongest evidence against the absurd, though frequent, charge of fraud. If I were inclined to deceive people, and if my witnesses had been willing to aid and abet me in so doing, I am sure that we should have produced testimony which would have been almost, if not quite, irrefutable. But it is not my intention to discuss how far fraud or lying could account for this

production. *Honi soit.* I am convinced of the honesty and integrity of my witnesses; and so far as my own part, viz. the production of the phenomena, is concerned, I care nothing for what self-appointed human judges may say or do.

Where it has been necessary to call myself something or other I have used the word "Seer" (to a small extent, of course) in preference to the word "medium," for the following reasons, which I think are only in accord with occult phraseology—

1. A medium is one who is or has been entranced or "controlled."
   I have never been entranced.
2. A medium is (generally) one who has "developed" his gifts by sitting in "circles," etc.
   I was born with my faculties.
3. A medium is functioned through (or functions) by becoming mentally "passive."
   I function by mental *activity*.
4. A medium is not a "spirit-control."
   "I" have often acted as a "spirit-control." (See Chapter VII.)

I mention the above reasons because I do not desire to be taken for one of those persons who, though producing no evidence at all to show that they are clairvoyant, yet, at the same time, pose as something superior to what in their vanity they call "a mere

spiritualistic medium.'' I give all honour and credit to those mediums who have *done* the *work*, produced the *facts*, and made belief in an after-life a possibility to the man of science, and to the materialist who must have ''proofs.'' At the same time, the word ''Seer'' is, in my opinion, admirably adapted to distinguish between a natural-born clairvoyant and a mediumistic clairvoyant, even if the latter has developed from ''trance'' to ''normal'' Clairvoyance.

What I may call myself is, however, a matter of no importance, for I know that the reader will call me what he thinks best, and I prefer that it should be so.

The majority of the examples which are submitted to the reader have, in the opinion of the writer, only an indirect relationship to Spiritual Seership. Perhaps it would be more correct to call them specimens of psychic, or super-normal, mental vision; for they appertain more to the realm of Occultism than to that of Mysticism. Nevertheless, the writer hopes that they may be of use, not only to the student of Spiritism, but also to the inquirer into Spiritualism. Although I have purposely refrained from touching upon the religious or philosophical side of the subject, I trust that the bare statements of fact may bring solace to some earnest soul which is seeking an answer to the question, ''Does man survive bodily death?'' After all is said and done, bare facts must speak louder than mere theory,

even though the latter be surrounded with a halo of literary ornament, and I take it that the reader does not want me to draw conclusions for him, but prefers to draw them for himself. Doubtless the Philosophy of True Spiritualism is a jewel in the Crown of Humanity; but the demonstrated facts are at least the gold in which the jewel is set.

The present writer is of the opinion that the attainment of that psychic, or super-normal, vision is one of the first steps to Spiritual Seership, and therefore it has its place in the spiritual, as well as in the mental, evolution of the man. It enables the Seer to produce evidence that the path he has trodden is in accordance with facts which have been demonstrated on the earth plane; and without proofs of the existence of this faculty within him the Seer can hardly expect sensible people to allow him to lead them very far into the Realm of the Higher Wisdom. I have come to the conclusion that in matters psychic there is a great danger of Delusion attaching itself to the mentality, and displacing Reason to such an extent that many otherwise honest people are led into making statements which are false, in the full belief that they are true. For my own part, I prefer to go for a short walk with Reason, rather than for a long tour with Imagination. It is far better to stop on the road and spend an hour or two in carefully examining the sign-posts and mile-stones, than to run as hard as ever you can along a road

which you *believe* to be the right one. If a person likes to delude himself, and to accept all that he *believes* as the TRUTH, he has a perfect right to do so; but, when he begins to dogmatize with unproven statements, he is injuring other people, and has *no* right to do *that*. "Prove a *little*, and we may believe *more*; but prove *nothing* and yet assert *much*, and we shall doubt all that you do say"; is, in my opinion, a good rule for those who "consult the oracle!"

I do not assert that a Seer or a medium should always be expected to demonstrate his Truths, as to do so is to tie the soul to the Earth-plane, and also because some Truths will not go into *words*, let alone into demonstrated phenomena (psychic or mental), without appearing to be *un*truths.

CHAPTER I.

ORDINARY CLAIRVOYANCE.

THE following letters are sufficiently self-explanatory to need little or no explanation from me. Where, however, any remarks are needed, they will be made as briefly as possible.

The first letter is not, strictly speaking, a "letter." I submitted the rough notes to Mr. J. W. Sharpe, and he signed them.

(No. 1.)

On April 11, 1903, Mr. J. W. Sharpe, a graduate of Cambridge University (a perfect stranger), called on me and we went for a walk, the better to discuss the topic of my letter in the *Daily Mail*.

Without any preparatory conversation I said to him, in the presence of a witness—

"You know a man who is going to disinherit his son because he is going to marry a barmaid against his father's wish."

At first Mr. Sharpe said—

"No, I don't!" And then, "Oh yes, I do! But I only know the man just to speak to, and not as a friend." I then described the son accurately.

A little later I said to him: "You have some china which is connected with India."

But as he did not seem to know for certain, I said—

"Oh yes, surely! And I see pictures of elephants on it." However, he did not call it to mind, and it was not until some weeks afterwards, when I went to

tea with him and pointed out to him the identical pieces of china with the elephants on them, that he remembered that he had such china in his house.

I then described his dining-room furniture to him, and the manner in which it was arranged; particularly mentioning some chairs which were carved in a certain style. He said—

"Oh! wait a bit. You are partly right, except the chairs; but you are horribly mixed up as to the position of the furniture."

However, when I went to take tea with him the chairs were in the dining-room, and upon my pointing them out to him, he said—

"Yes, yes; you were quite right! I had clean forgotten that chairs of that sort were in *this* room."

"Well, then,' I said, "if you take this room as viewed from the window, the easiest way for my 'spirit body' to see it, you will see that I was *not* mixed up in my description." He replied—

"No! By Jove, you were right!"

On April 13, 1903, I again called and had tea with him, and whilst talking, I said—

"Wait a minute, some one else is here."

"A spirit?"

"Yes, of a lady!"

"Can you describe her?"

"Yes! She is a short, dark lady, with a high forehead, prominent nose, nice mouth; her chin is not so perfect; her hair is parted in the middle; she is dressed in black, she wears a lace collar, cameo brooch, a large jet bead necklace, etc., etc."

He recognized the description, but in order to test me further, he handed me an album and asked me if I could pick out her photograph. I looked through it, and gave it aback to him, saying–

"She is not here."

He gave me another album, and I opened it and put my finger on the first photo in the book, saying–

"This is she." I was so certain that I did not trouble to look any further.

He said: "You are quite right; it is the photo of my mother, who died—some years ago."

The photo was not so true to life as was my description, as it did not show the lace collar that she usually wore when indoors.

On April 14, 1903, "I" determined to go over to Mr. Sharpe's house, leaving "Me" in bed, in order to see what he was doing, and to call upon him the next day and tell him what "I" had seen. This would be a good test for him.

On the 16*th* (as the 15th was wet) I called on him and told him what "I" had done, and exactly what "I" had seen. He replied—

"That is a particularly good test, and, what is more, it is absolutely correct. You might have come three hundred times and not have found me doing what I was then, as I make it a rule never to do so-and-so at that hour, as it disturbs my rest."

On April 22, 1903, I called on Mr. Sharpe, and during the afternoon said—

"You own some cottage property, and you used to have a man to collect the rents, but you found out that he robbed you."

He replied: "Quite right; the man is now dead."

Perhaps I may rather astonish the reader who believes in the necessity of "good conditions" while giving Clairvoyance, when I tell him that the following experience took place in a refreshment-room. It occurred at a time when I thought Clairvoyance might be "clever guess work, due to a knowledge of facial expression."

(No. 2.)

Feb. 29, 1904.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

In reply to your question as to my remembering your having correctly foretold the past and future in

connection with an actor. He was introduced to us about, I believe, in May, 1902, at ——. I beg to state I distinctly remember the coincidence, and, to the best of my belief, the conversation ran in this way:—The actor asked you to try if you could tell him anything of his past and of his life. Without any hesitation you immediately replied, "Yes; three years ago you were at Scarborough, and whilst there you lost some papers of value only to yourself." He replied, "Quite right." He then asked if you could tell him anything of what he had been doing during that day. You said, "Yes, you have been to Scotland Yard in a new hansom cab with blue wheels, and you have inquired there as to the whereabouts of a certain man whose name and appearance was known to you. They answered you that, to the best of their belief the man was in Buenos Ayres." The actor replied that this was quite correct. You then said to the actor, "I don't believe the Scotland Yard authorities are correct, and if you will go to the 'Angel,' at Islington, you will find the man there." As the actor did not believe this, he remained seated for some twenty minutes; he then, however, altered his determination, and was driven to the "Angel," Islington, arranging to meet you the next evening and tell you the result of his inquiries. The next evening you met him about the same place and time, and he (the actor) informed you that when he got to the "Angel," Islington, the previous evening the man had left the house about half an hour previously, showing that at the time you said the man was at the "Angel," Islington, he was actually there. The actor then asked you if you could inform him where the man was then; you said, "In about three days' time, if you will go to B—— to the office of Mr. ——, the solicitor, you will find the man there, endeavouring to sell or make use of the papers that you have lost."

Some four or five days after this we again met the actor, and he informed us that the events that you had foretold had happened, and that the man was in

the hands of the police. I also beg to state that I have seen the original letter from this actor to you distinctly stating all the above occurrences, and to the best of my belief this letter was destroyed on your leaving this office through ill-health.

Yours truly,

J. S. R——.

Unfortunately I could not verify the statements of the actor, as he seemed to be unwilling to discuss the particulars of the case. So I offer the letter for what it is worth!

The following letter is one which I wrote to *Light*, November 18, 1905. I give it as it appeared, and follow it by the letter of evidence from my visitor. There is, as mentioned in the letter, a rather unusual phase of Clairvoyance; it appears to be a good case of extended vision, or long-distance Clairvoyance. At the time I felt as if I was actually *seeing into* the "Spirit" world. I did not see the "spirits" in the room with us as is usual.

"SPIRITS" IN THEIR HOME.

SIR,

On November 7th an inquirer, a perfect stranger, called upon me as hon. president of the Bournemouth Spiritualist Society, for particulars of the society, etc. I may here explain that, although I have the gifts of travelling in my spirit body, and of Clairvoyance, etc., these gifts have been, through a long and dangerous illness, held in abeyance. Thank God, they have returned with convalescence. After giving the inquirer the information he desired, I saw, in a lovely

garden with flowers like sapphires and diamonds, the spirit of a lady, whom I described, and she was recognized as having passed away thirty-five years ago. Then she was joined by a much younger lady, whom I described, giving her name. All this was correct. So far, there is nothing more than ordinary Clairvoyance. Now a strange thing happened. The younger lady seemed urging the elder to give my caller a "good test," and she smiled and nodded. Then with a few quick "passes" she produced a girl child, aged about four, evidently from the atmosphere around her. I described this child "form" or model or "doll," and the clothes it wore, even to the colour of the sash, all of which were immediately recognized as being, said the father, "what my daughter was like when she was four years old." Further, I got a *boy's* name for this *girl* model, and when I gave it the father said, "Quite right; it was a pet name we called her by as a child."

I am prepared to swear to the truth of the above, and I have my visitor's *written* testimony to substantiate my descriptions. I did not see the spirits in the *room*, but in their home above, and I thank God that He has restored my lost heavenly treasure, and permitted me to be the means of convincing an anxious fellow-man that there is *no* death. Perhaps I may add that I honestly believe that I have my gifts because I asked God for them, *believing* He *could* and would give me treasures beyond the reach of moth and rust, and where thieves do not break in and steal.

VINCENT N. TURVEY.

Bournemouth.

The following is a letter from my visitor testifying to the truth of above letter. The daughter referred to was, of course, still in the body and grown up to be a young woman.

(No. 3.)

Bournemouth,
Nov. 7, 1905.

DEAR SIR,

You have described the appearance of my grandmother, also that of my cousin, E—— P——, minutely. E—— P—— passed away two years ago, and my grandmother about thirty-five years ago.

You also gave the name and description of my daughter when very young; this being very strange, as the name "Bobbie" was given, which was a pet name she was known by as an infant.

Yours faithfully,
M—— Q——.

The following letter written by me appeared in *Light*, December 16, 1905; and the two immediately following it are letters testifying to the truth of my statements.

"SPIRIT" IDENTITY BEYOND DOUBT.

SIR,

At our séance three Tuesdays ago (seven sitters) a spirit came into the room, and being normally clairvoyant I described him "without one weak point," as stated in the letter of testimony from the two sitters for whom he came. One of them said, "Can you see anything about his eyes?" I replied, "One has a white fleck in it." "Can you see how he got it?" "Yes, iron-stab, Amsterdam." "Quite correct," replied the sitter, "he had a white fleck in one eye caused by a stab from a bit of iron at Amsterdam."

I then said to the sitter, Well, if Captain H—— (the spirit) comes again he must give another proof as I shall not re-describe him, neither shall I say, "Oh, Captain H—— is here,' as I might be a liar or merely a victim of imagination." The next Tuesday Captain H—— came again. I waited. Then he described to

me a room, its furniture, lamp light, sort of fireplace, etc., in which the sitter was at one time ill with pains in his head. "All correct," said the sitter. "Now," I said, "a man enters that room, bangs a parcel on the table, and leaves a lot of thawing snow on the carpet from his broad welted boots." "I know," said the sitter, "that is exactly what happened, and the man was Captain H——." "Yes," I said, "and as a further test he says your doctor was So-and-so" (giving a full description). The sitter said, "That is a *good* likeness of the doctor, and Captain H—— *did* know him."

On the following Tuesday I said, "A spirit has been to see me during the last week and he says his next proof of identity will be something about his pulling down a window violently and then saying, "That's —— funny!" "No more is needed," said my sitter, "it *is* Captain H——; he pulled a window down in my studio, and the glass fell into the street. The servant gave a man *2s. 6d.* to buy some glass to repair it, but the man went off with the money and never returned, and so Captain H—— laughed and said, 'It is —— funny.' "

Now, sir, I consider that Captain H—— has proved his identity, and also that "There is no death."

VINCENT N. TURVEY.

Bournemouth.

(No. 4.)

Bournemouth,
Nov. 24, 1905.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Whilst sitting in a circle at your house recently, you described standing near me a spirit form—a seafaring man, black curly beard, loose baggy trousers, pea-jacket, broad square-toed boots, grey eyes, one of which had a "fleck" in it, and you received the words "Iron, Amsterdam." He left the room looking over his shoulder seeming to say, "STREET, don't be a fool."

This I and my wife (who was also present) recognized as the form of a master mariner who was known to us in his earth life, nearly six hundred miles away. I shall not give you any more particulars about him, as I wish to obtain, if possible, something else about him from you. But in the description you gave there was not one weak point. He had black curly beard, always wore *extremely baggy* trousers, in fact, it was a standing joke. Pea-jacket, grey eyes, one of which had a white fleck in it; this *was* caused by a Dago seaman with a piece of *iron at Amsterdam*. His trick of looking over his shoulder when leaving a room was always noticed, and the message he gave bears on the subject he last talked about just before he passed on through the sinking of the vessel he commanded.

Yours faithfully,
P. F. STREET.

(No. 5A.)

Bournemouth,
Jan. 9, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I have read your letter in *Light* (about December 16, 1905) *re* Captain Hamilton's three distinct tests of "Spirit Identity beyond Doubt." It is all true as stated, and occurred in front of six people. You have condensed it for space-saving purposes evidently.

P. R. STREET.

The reader will notice that the first of the two above letters only accounts for *one* visit of Captain Hamilton. This is because it was written before my letter appeared in *Light*. The second letter (the other half of which is under Chapter VII., "Functioning in 'Mental' or 'Spirit-Body' "), however, confirms the remaining two visits, and in fact, the whole of my letter to *Light*.

The following letters need no explanation from me.

(No. 5.)

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I am quite willing to attest the accuracy of the following—

On March 22, 1905, I called to have tea with your wife, and you joined us. This was the first time I had spoken to you. Whilst having tea you asked me—

"Are, or were, any of your relations in the Army?"

Without thinking I replied, "No!" and after a pause added, "Oh! yes, my first husband was a soldier."

"Oh!" you replied, "I thought so, because I see a soldier behind your chair."

A few minutes afterwards you said, "When your husband was thinking did he walk up and down like this?" Here you imitated his action correctly.

"Oh! yes, he did," I said.

We then went out on the verandah, and whilst sitting there talking you described a female spirit to me, and added—

"She used to live in the country." From your description I recognized an aunt of mine who used to live in the country.

A little while later you said to me, "Have you ever suffered from an illness that caused you pain here?"—laying your hand on your side.

I said, "Yes! and you have correctly described the pain and symptoms from which I had suffered."

Yours truly,

H. BENNETT.

(No. 6.)

Jan. 3, 1906.

DEAR MR TURVEY,

I called on you on January 1, 1906, and you described four or five spirits as being with me. Two I did not recognize at once. One, a military man, I

recognized directly his name was given, but it was not until I got home that I remembered the other, who was a Cardinal, the author of a book, who died in a warm climate, as stated by you, which is quite correct, he having died in Italy about 1840.

Yours truly,
M—— Q——.

(No. 7.)

Jan. 5, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

The little sitting (if I may call it such) that I had with you last Friday was another instance of the wonderful power of Clairvoyance. You so distinctly described many friends, both "living" and in the "Spirit-world." Indeed, it quite appeared as if the room was full of them. There was no mistake whatever as to their identity. In almost every instance they appeared as if anxious to help, and distinctly answered when I asked questions.

Yours very truly,
H. ELLIS.

(No. 8.)

Bournemouth,
Nov. 25, 1905.

DEAR SIR,

I was recently sitting in a circle at your house during which you described the interior of a room wherein some one was lying ill. You also described the pain which he was suffering. This I recognized as the room in which my brother passed on, every detail of the description you gave was perfectly accurate, even to the pains which he suffered. This I consider a wonderful clairvoyant test, as previous to that occasion you had never known me or any of my relatives.

Yours truly,
(MRS.) C. STREET.

(No. 9.)

Notts,
Mar. 2, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I have much pleasure in bearing testimony to your clairvoyant power, as you described the "spirit form" of a soldier whom I knew, and who was killed in the South African war. Also your description of several past events was correct, it being of course quite impossible for you to have obtained knowledge of them through the ordinary or common channels.

Yours truly,
A— J— M— —.

(No. 10.)

Bournemouth,
Jan. 9, 1906

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I am pleased to say that the description I had from you the other night was correct in all details. I recognised the old lady described as my "grandmother," who passed away eight years ago, and the details were clearly given.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN WALKER.

(No. 11.)

Bournemouth,
May 30, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I am taking the liberty to write to you as I think your would be pleased to know that I have recognized the lady you saw with me last night. I mean the one who impressed you with the sentence "Crossing the Road." It is a cousin of mine with whom I lived for some time when a boy.

I had a good look at my mother's photo after I got home, and I must say your description of her is perfect.

Yours truly,
F. T. BLAKE.

(No. 12.)

Bournemouth,
Feb. 16, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

During our interview this afternoon you gave a very accurate description of the spirit-form of my mother, who passed away years ago at the age of twenty-five.

You also described my father-in-law, and the old family property of C——.

You also referred to a carriage accident which happened to me about eight years ago when I was thrown out of my Ralli-cart, and narrowly escaped having my neck broken. In addition, you gave me information concerning the future, which time will verify, and you spoke of the past in a manner which was absolutely correct.

I have been suffering from indigestion, and without my mentioning the subject of my health to you, you described the symptoms and gave me advice respecting diet, exercise, rest and medicine, which I intend to follow.

Yours truly,
C. DICKENSON.

(No. 13.)

Bournemouth,
Jan. 30, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I called upon you with a friend two weeks ago, and during a conversation upon psychical phenomena, you marvellously described, as standing near me, my spirit guide. By your description I recognized, without any effort of imagination, a young lady I had been intimately associated with. I have mentioned this to one or two mutual friends, whose look of awe when half through the description is quite convincing enough as to its correctness. As far as I recollect your description was as follows: "A young lady with a pleasant oval face, five feet six inches in height, who often wore a 'toque,' well marked and defined eye-

brows, oval- or almond-shaped eyes, well-shaped nose—not long; upper row of teeth slightly prominent, but not retarding the symmetry of the features; small and well-shaped hands. One who died between five and seven years ago."

You were absolutely correct in every detail except height, as she was tall, quite five feet eight-and-a-half when wearing heels; her hands though beautiful were not conspicuously small. I thought the period of her death at the time incorrect, but I have since ascertained that she died in 1900.

I have much pleasure in thus testifying to your powers of Clairvoyance, etc., etc.

H. JENNINGS.

The sentence "quite five feet eight-and-a half when wearing heels"—to correct my modest five feet six, —is amusing. Had he actually measured her, with and without heels, I wonder?

The next little incident I consider rather interesting, because the person for whom the "spirit" made himself visible to me put test questions to him, and got absolutely correct answers, and this in the presence of five people.

On April 10, 1906, we were sitting in a room lighted by a 16-candle power electric lamp, when I saw a spirit-form come in through the locked door. I said—

"A 'spirit' has just come in, I will describe him."

I did so, giving full particulars as to figure and face, and added—

"He is a soldier who died in India, and he

is dressed in the uniform of a Scotch regiment.''

My friend asked me if I could say *which* regiment. Now as I am quite ignorant of uniforms and tartans, I said—

''I don't know, but I'll give you a description of his kilt.''

This I did, and my friend said—

''Quite right, he was in the Gordon Highlanders. I recognize him.''

As a test he asked the Highlander the following questions, and received the following *correct* answers—

What is your name?	J—— M——.
Where did you enlist?	Glasgow.
Where were you living?	Rutherglen.
What was your chum's name?	''Pat.''
How many sisters have you?	Two.

On September 10, 1906, a friend asked me if I would care to join a little yachting party which he had arranged. I thanked him, and he replied, ''Well, meet us at Bournemouth West Station, and I will introduce you.''

I want the reader to understand that I was a stranger to all the party save my host. At the station I met my friend, three ladies, and two gentlemen; I also saw two ''spirits''—a sailor and a soldier—standing at a little distance from the group. We got into the train, went to the harbour, and then rowed to the yacht. After we had been sailing for some time the conversation turned to ''the occult,'' and I was

asked, "Can you 'see' anything with any one here?" I told them of the two unseen additions to our party, and of course they smiled; however, when I described the soldier to one lady and the sailor to another, they both admitted the correctness of the descriptions. I append half the letter from my host; the other half is under Chapter V.—"Phone-Voyance."

(No. 14A.)

Bournemouth,
May 16, 1907.

DEAR SIR,

I remember and bear witness to the fact that you described two or three spirits to two ladies who made up my yachting party last year, and they recognized the descriptions. The ladies were strangers to you, only introduced an hour or two before to you by me . . .

Yours truly,
C. PONTIFEX.

On January 11, 1908, a gentleman called to see me, and after a little conversation on Spiritualism and kindred topics, he asked me to psychometrize a pair of gloves that belonged to his son. I took the gloves in my hand and immediately "sensed" certain traits of character, etc., which were very difficult to mention to a father about his son. However, I said what the gloves "told" me, and added, "I may of course be mistaken." To judge by the *looks* and words of my visitor I *was* most *decidedly* wrong in every particular. I knew that I was right for all that, and the following letter shows an extraordinary solution of the case. It is also another blow to the so-called explanation "Telepathy."

(No. 15.)

Bournemouth,
Jan. 30, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I have much pleasure in stating that, on January 11, I called on you, and in course of conversation asked you to psychometrize a pair of gloves belonging to my son. Your description was wrong, both as regards my son's appearance and character. When I got home, however, I found on inquiry that the gloves had been left for several days in another man's house, and that most probably this man had worn them. The description you gave exactly fitted this man's appearance and character.

Yours,

J— M— K——.

A REMARKABLE DAY.

The following true story is so strange that I decided to write it out in full myself and submit the MS. to the people concerned, asking them merely for a short note vouching for the truth of my statements. I do not consider it necessary to get proof from my morning visitor; and my word is all that I can offer to the reader for my afternoon experience; but the *evening* experience is "signed, sealed, and delivered."

On the morning of February 28, 1908, a man called at my door, selling books for the Christian Evidence Society. He sent in a sample. Noticing an article about Spiritualism being of the Devil—phenomena not denied—I went to the door myself and asked the man to come in. Well! we "debated," and of course both of us won, in our own opinions. Before departing, however, my visitor said a prayer,

asking God to open my eyes "to the true Light"—by which he meant, I presume, to ask that I might lose my Devil's Gift of Clairvoyance (which, by the way, in older days was the hall-mark of the Man of God—Seer or Prophet) and have my "understanding" "opened" or twisted into conformity with his own opinions. After he had insisted that "the 'devils' would now leave" *he* went away.

On lying down in the afternoon, in order to rest and meditate, I suddenly saw three or four "devils" in the room—typical orthodox fiends. Men with goats' legs, cloven hoofs, little horns just over their ears, curly hair like a negro's "wool," tails, and claw-like hands. In colour they were entirely brown, like ordinary brown paper. I candidly confess that I was "a bit shaken," and I venture to think that any clairvoyant would have been. I sat up to see if I were dreaming. Was I "hallucinated"? No more than I am at other times, when I see "spirits," and their descriptions are recognized. I pulled myself together and rose into the "higher state of consciousness," *i.e.* got beyond the ordinary clairvoyant state that I generally use, say for public Clairvoyance. In this "state" I was able to see not only their fronts but also their backs. To my utter astonishment they were all *hollow at the back*, like embossed leather, or the ordinary papier-mâché mask. Then my guardians caused me to make a sign, say a word, or think a sentence—what I do not know; but

directly it was done or said, these forms disintegrated or dissolved, and vanished. To get an idea of the manner in which they disappeared the reader must imagine a cloud of steam, laden with fine dust made from cardboard, for that was the colour and the *smell*, as nearly as I can describe them, of these creations of a mind which believed that God actually created a species of "man-goat-bird" animals to torture His Humanity.

On the evening of that day—February 28, 1908—a Miss P—— asked if I would see her. I said "Yes," and she was hardly seated before a Mr. LANE was announced. When people come to "inquire" without notice, I usually see them together, if they are strangers to each other; for it saves me much exertion.

When we were seated, a "spirit" dragged himself into the room. I described him. The lady recognized him as her brother H——. I "felt" violent pain and a deadness of my legs, and sickness to such an extent that I had to light a cigarette. The lady said her brother had died of paralysis, and had suffered from sickness. Harry (as I will now call the "spirit") showed me a white feeding-cup with a pink line round the brim, and said, "Oh, I did hate the beastly thing." Miss P—— said that the cup was as described, and that Harry did hate the thing, as it hurt him to try to drink. Then he showed me some "flat things like piles of books," and said, "Tell, 'Sis' to tell mother not to hoard up my things and cry

over them, but to give my fishing rods to A—— and my other things (guns) to B——.'' His sister said that the flat things were tin boxes, that her mother *did* cry over them a great deal, in fact, was broken hearted. I asked: ''But do you know whom he means by A—— and B——?'''' Oh yes,'' she said, ''his two brothers. We were going to give both his rods and his guns to B——; but now of course A—— shall have the rods.'' Then Harry said: ''There's a woman in my room, with a blue dressing-gown on; the bed has square pillows on it; what does she want 'nosing around my place'?'' Miss P—— said the woman had a blue dressing-grown —the pillows were square, and she *was to occupy that room that very evening.* Harry then said: ''Well! for more 'identity proof,' tell her I was educated at Cheltenham.'' This, Miss P—— said, was correct. He then gave me a correct description of his brother B——, who was in India, which I repeated to Miss P——, and he added: ''Those ponies hurt his leg.'' All of which was correct.

Then he gave me a picture of their house in the country; and he added that his favourite servant was ''the little short stout maid''— all of which was correct. After this he said: ''Ask E—— (Miss P——) what about the blue ribbon which she has in her top right-hand drawer with a charm on it.'' Miss P—— seemed excited at this, and acknowledged that she had actually cut the ribbon from off his neck just before he died.

Continuing, he described correctly his grandfather S—— to me, and I repeated the description. He also mentioned a medal on his watch chain. He added: "Now then, old girl, I will see you home!" Miss P—— has written me to say: "Last night I was awake a great deal and you and my brother seemed to be present."

The two letters of testimony concerning the last incident are as follows--

(No. 16.)

S——,
Mar. 16, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I return the three pages of MS. relating to my visit to you on the evening of February 28, 1908. I have endorsed back of each sheet.

The statements made are correct and the whole thing is a fair account, unexaggerated, of what took place.

Yours truly,
E. P——.

(No. 17.)

Bournemouth,
Mar. 20, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Herewith I return your MS. regarding the visit I paid you on February 28, which I have endorsed.

I consider that the account is a correct recital of what took place. As I was not personally acquainted with the spirit I am unable to vouch for the correctness of the facts* mentioned, although I can honestly say,

* The writer of the letter means that he cannot vouch for such facts as the name of the "spirit," as he did not know him, but he *does* vouch for the fact that Miss P—— *admitted* the "spirit's" name was Harry.

that what you said, as per MS., was at once recognized by Miss P—— as being quite true and in every respect characteristic of her brother. I was very greatly impressed with all I heard and was astonished at the accuracy of the details as confirmed by Miss P——.

Yours truly,
F. LANE.

CHAPTER II.

PUBLIC CLAIRVOYANCE.

As regards my public experiences, the reader will readily understand that I could do no more than I have done, so far as getting evidence was concerned. My method was to keep a book in which I put down the date, the number of descriptions given, the number recognized, and a few of the chief points of any description which I thought was slightly above the average. This book was signed by two, three, or four officials of the Society within a few hours. From it I have reconstructed my "Public Experiences" as herein laid before the reader, and I have submitted the MS. to three witnesses mentioned in the Voucher.

Up to May, 1908, I have given one hundred and sixty descriptions in public. Of these, one hundred and forty-five were recognized as true visions, leaving only fifteen unverified. There are many causes of non-recognition. Some may probably be—

I. The person will not recognize the description, on principle; as he thinks "it is all a fraud," and will not be a party to it.

II. Surprise may "take him all-aback."

III. A lady may be nervous and dislike being referred to in public.

IV. A person may come, hoping that she will get a description of her father; and if she gets one of a casual acquaintance she cannot "call her to mind," and says "No" without thinking. [Many of my descriptions have been recognized a week or even a month afterwards.]

V. The utter inability of some people to recognize anything by means of description, other than photographs or pictures.

In order to prevent tiresome repetition and wearisome details, I shall ask my reader to understand that the words "I described a spirit," or "after giving the usual points," may be taken to mean much more than at first appears. The following typical (imaginary) example may be taken as a sample of what I call the "usual points, etc."

"Behind you stands a tall man, rather thin, but broad shouldered; that is to say, not a fleshy person, but yet big. He has dark-brown hair, curly in front, and a big moustache like Kitchener's, lighter in colour than his hair. His nose is long, and rather thin at the nostrils; his eyes are grey; his ears stand away from his head more than is usual; his mouth is firm and straight, and rather large: the lips are thin and are not very red. His hads are long and

white, the nails well kept. He appears to limp a little on the right leg. I see him in a brown Norfolk jacket and grey trousers. I get the impression that he was musical, and that he was not fond of very vigorous exercise. I am not sure what killed him, but I feel a great pain in my chest, and as if blood flowed out of my mouth. He died suddenly.''

I now lay before the reader some of my experiences on the public platfrom.

On September 16, 1906, I gave seven descriptions, all of which were recognized. I very minutely described a soldier, even to his uniform, standing behind a lady. However, as she did not appear to be quite satisfied, and asked for more details, I replied—

''He died in Egypt eight years ago; and I get the impression that he was killed, but not in war. I suffer pain in both my arms, as if they were mangled or cut off.'

''Oh yes,'' she replied. ''I know him well; he was killed in a railway accident, but I had been thinking of another soldier I knew.''

I said, ''Now a little old lady joins him.'' And I gave her description.

''Yes, that is his mother,'' said the lady.

Then I said, ''Now I see a little cottage—an orchard—and a well.''

''Yes, that is where they lived,'' replied the lady.

On September 30, 1906, I gave six descriptions, all of which were recognized, five at the

time, and one during the following week, after the person had had time "to think about it." There were two that I consider worth recording. One was very short, in fact, only two or three words, but it was none the less strange for that reason. After the service, a stranger, who had only just arrived in Bournemouth, came to me with a plain sealed envelope in his hand, and said, "What do you get from that?" I touched it only, and got a shock.

"Man," I said, "why did you bring *that* here? I get *sudden death—suicide*—from it."

"Well," he replied, "a man connected with the contents of that envelope *was* found dead on the railway—killed—but we did not *suspect* suicide, though of course it may have been so."

When we had formed the "after-circle," I said to a lady, "Behind you, madam, is standing a young lady; her age is about twenty-six. She has long black hair trailing down her back —a small mouth—small ears—dark brown eyes, long white hands, etc., etc. I judge her to be of well-formed figure; but I cannot see that clearly, as she is in night attire. She is standing at an open window, gazing at the starry heavens in some foreign land. The room is not furnished with a suite but with odd pieces; the bed is of painted iron, and faces the window. On the right of the bed is a mahogany wardrobe—then a fireplace—then a walnut chest of drawers. In front of the window is a stained deal table, and on it a birch looking-glass; the next wall is blank, and on the left

of the bed is the door. Now she moves the table, pulls up the blue blind, opens the window and gazes at the stars. It appears to me as if she often did this. Now I feel a violent blow on the head—what does it mean?''

The lady replied: ''She was a somnambulist; and it was out of that window she fell on her head, and was killed. The description is perfect in every detail as to the figure and also as to the room; and it was in a foreign country six thousand miles away, where the stars *are* very bright at night-time.''

On October 21, 1906, I gave five descriptions, all of which were recognized, four at the time and one a week or so later. I think the whole series is worth recording.

As the carriage drove up to my house to take me to the hall, I was ''impressed'' to go to my library and take a certain book with me. However, I thought ''what nonsense''; but when I got to the front door I was strongly impressed to go back to my library and put the book in my pocket. During the ''after-circle'' I said, ''Has any one been looking for a book this week?'' A lady said, ''Yes, I have. I have tried all the libraries and book-dealers, but they say it is out of print and they cannot get it.''

''What is the name of the book?'' I asked.

'' 'Researches in Spiritualism,' by Professor William Crookes,'' she replied.

''Well, madam,'' said I, ''if you will go to that overcoat'' (pointing to my own) ''you will find it in the pocket.''

A critic will say: "Oh, a well-planned bit of theatricalism to impress the audience." Well, yes, it *looks* like it, but I am *not* a showman.

There was a man in the circle; it was evidently his first attendance, he seemed shy and retiring. A "spirit" came for him. I described the spirit—height, age, eyes, hair; nose, dress, etc., etc.—and added, "he was killed through a bicycle accident—not *directly*, but indirectly—because I 'sense' the fall and feel the shock; but I also 'get' a great difficulty in breathing. Furthermore, he tells me that he did not work in a shop, but at a long wide counter, such as is in a bank or insurance office.

"Yes," the gentleman replied, "the description is exact; and he died of lung trouble brought on by a bad bicyle accident, and he worked in X & Co's counting-house."

I was very pleased to have given a stranger his first description; and some weeks later I gave him another, even more detailed, of his uncle.

The next description was a very unpleasant one *for me*. It was very much out of the ordinary as regards the "death" scene; and, *as I felt all the pain*, the reader will understand why I am glad that such are not met with frequently.

I gave the usual ten or eleven descriptive points of the "spirit" of a young man, and added that I was in agony all over—every bone seemed smashed—and all my inside

seemed torn, "as if I'd been picked up in machinery and dashed to bits." The man to whom I gave the description said it was correct, and that the method of death was "being caught in a wheel, and dashed round and round on to a wall."

There was a gentleman sitting outside the circle, and I mistook him for a reporter—as a matter of fact he was one who "only came to see what you do." I gave him a very detailed description of a young lady, and added "drowned a long time ago in a mill-pond or weir. At any rate, I see a *mill* there, and the water is smooth." He said, "No, I do not know her at all." I let the matter drop, as I do not care about "digging." About three weeks later he came to me and said, "Mr. Turvey, you remember giving me a description of a young lady who was drowned?"

I said, "Yes."

"Well," he said, "it was thirty years ago; but I quite remember it now. I intended to go over a certain bridge, but altered my mind. At the time I should have been on the bridge it gave way, and that young lady, who was on it at the time, was drowned. And close by is 'Morton's' Flour Mills."

I may as well insert part of a letter from our Secretary which will prove my statement.

Bournemouth,
Oct. 26, 1906.

DEAR SIR,

You will remember that on Sunday evening last,

you described a young lady standing by the side of the gentleman who was sitting outside the circle at the back of the Hall (the one who gave you the book). You will also no doubt recollect that you said she was drowned in a mill-pond or weir. I have heard to-day that the gentleman has since recollected the circumstances and identified the young lady.

Yours faithfully,
F. T. BLAKE.

To go back to our meeting. As the gentleman seemed honest in his scepticism, I told him I was sorry he did not recognize the young lady (at the meeting) but I was sure she was there, and that he would recognize her later on. Somehow or other the question of psychometry was raised, and I said, "Oh yes, I can generally 'get' something if I touch an article belonging to anybody." He immediately handed me a book, and said, "I will take you at your word. Give me something from that." I touched the cover for a second or two, and then I gave him a long description of "a little old lady." Describing her characteristics, etc., I said, "She lived in a house standing in its own grounds. In the sitting-room I see an oval-shaped walnut table—on it is a lighted oil-lamp—no silk shade—and a red tablecloth, and I judge the house to be a good distance out of the town or village."

He replied, "It is a perfect description of my mother, her characteristics; and the house, table, lamp, etc., are also quite correct."

On August 11, 1907, I gave two descriptions, only one of which was recognized. But as it

was rather striking I will record it. It was striking in more ways than one; for, when giving it, I suffered the most terrible pains—somewhat similar to those I felt on October 21, 1906, when I gave the description "of a young man killed by machinery." In this case the bodily death was caused by a boiler explosion. The description was that of a young man, a sailor. After giving details as to height, age, eyes, hair, complexion, etc., I said, "He met his death suddenly, for I feel as if my body is mangled and torn." The lady to whom the description was given, said her brother, who was on board H.M.S. *Wallaroo*, was killed by a boiler explosion five years ago. As this is the only case which has brought me a letter of evidence from one of the audience, I insert it for perusal.

Poole,
Aug. 12, 1907.

DEAR SIR,

I wish to send my hearty thanks for the splendid description of our brother who was killed on board H.M.S. *Wallaroo* just five years ago, in Australia, through a boiler explosion. He gave a message which was very important. Hoping you will be spared to go on with the work you are doing for the good of humanity for a long time to come.

Yours, etc.,
E. FRY

The message referred to was very remarkable, it contained three distinct references. The first was very funny, and will show how little *my* mind has to do with the clairaudience.

The reader, in order to appreciate the joke, must be told that for years I have been what is called a *chest* patient, that is, I have been suffering from various chest complaints. Now, as I know that "spirits" have not got physical chests, and mortals cannot well worry about "spirits' " chests, I was absolutely astonished when the "spirit" said, "Tell them not to worry about my *chest.*" I repeated the message in spite of its apparent foolishness, and asked, "What on *earth* does the lad mean?" The reply staggered me. "Oh," said the lady, "he means his *'diddy-box,'* as sailors call their sea-chests; it got lost and we have never been able to trace it."

Now I honestly assert that I had never heard of a diddy-box, and the only thing that the word *chest* conveys to my mind is the "lung department" of the human body. (That is, unless the word is clearly defined, like oak-chest or medicine chest.)

He (the "spirit") went on to say: "Tell them not to transact the business with the people on the hill." This also was understood. Then he gave a warning as to the seriousness of the pain in his aunt's side. The lady acknowledged that the aunt had complained of pain, but thought it a trivial matter.

On October 20, 1907, I gave three descriptions, only one of which was recognized at the time. This was a very detailed one of a young man of foreign appearance, who returned to thank a member of the audience for a kindness

he had received at his hands. The gentleman asked if I could give any information as to that particular act. "Yes," I replied, "the 'spirit' says that, as he lay dying, he asked you to look after, and help, his mother when he was gone. He again thanks you for having done so." The gentleman acknowledged that this was correct.

One of the remaining two, which were both recognized later on in the week, was also given in great detail; first as to the uniform in which the "spirit" appeared, then as to the cottage and surrounding scenery where he (the "spirit") patted a little boy on the head. The little boy being the grown-up elderly man to whom I gave the description.

On January 26, 1908, I gave seven descriptions, all of which proved to be correct. But the most striking one of them all was not recognized until the lady went home and discussed the incident with a friend. Besides giving the usual number of points as to sex, height, age, hair, eyes, nose, mouth, moustache, etc., I said that the "spirit" "was the third son of a titled man, a member of the Carlton Club, and fond of mountaineering."

On February 9, 1908, I gave six descriptions, five of which were recognized. One was that of a young man, a soldier, killed in the Soudan, whose name was short—like "Tom" or "Bob" The lady to whom it was given had to ***write home*** before she got it recognized by her aunt. I have printed her letter under the heading of

"Visitants," Chapter III.; letter No. 22.

One of the others is almost laughable. It was in itself an ordinary description—that of a young man who had been *both* to Oxford and to Cambridge. He was killed by an accidental "blow on the head" given by a friend. It is hardly necessary to say that I felt the blow also. The funny thing about this is, that it was the "spirit" of the first husband of the lady who was, at the time, sitting in the audience with her second husband; and on the following Sunday (February 16) this second husband's first wife's "spirit" returned the compliment by appearing for him as he was sitting with the second wife already mentioned. On the same date (February 16, 1908) I gave five descriptions, four of which were correct. The only one which I consider to be rather good was as follows: I described an elderly lady—height, eyes, nose, mouth, etc. The lady to whom I described this "spirit" asked whether she had anything that had belonged to the "spirit." I replied that I could only *say* what I "*saw*"; but the "spirit" showed me a long gold chain, and, after taking it from her neck, deliberately broke it. The lady said: "That is a very good test—for when my grandmother died that gold chain was broken in three parts, and each of us three girls had a part."

On February 23, 1908, I gave three descriptions, all of which were correct. Only one of them is worth mentioning, and this was the description of a remarkable looking man, after

the style of a serio-comic. After the usual personal details as to face, etc., were given, I described the house, room and conditions under which he died; and added that his name began with a "B," although he was usually known by a nickname, such as "Little Joe" or "Sunny Jim," and I continued, speaking to the gentleman for whom he came: "He says you helped him, financially, to return to his own country."

On March 15, 1908, I gave six descriptions, all of which were correct. Two of the "spirits" were announced from the platform as Visitants, who called to see me during the week—one a naval lieutenant, the other a young musical man. (Accounts of these two incidents will be found under Chapter III., "Visitants.") The remaining four were detailed descriptions of (1) a dean of the Church of England who was very proud of his library; (2) a young boy about fifteen years of age; and (3) an old lady who described herself as "Mother." The (fourth) one worthy of a fuller notice was "a dark, handsome young man, fairly tall, etc., etc. He was very proud of his dark hair, and spent rather too much time before the glass while combing and brushing it. He was particular as to his *face*, but somewhat careless about his clothes. His taste in colours was rather loud." I went on to say, "he was a butcher's assistant, and that the father of the person for whom he (the "spirit") comes helped him financially when he got into trouble through his wild ways,

and assisted him to join the Army in a mounted regiment.''

This description was not recognized at the time, as I gave it to the wrong person. But the following extract from a letter (the remainder of which is given in Chapter III., ''Visitants'') will prove that the description was correct—

Bournemouth,
Mar. 16, 1908.

DEAR MR TURVEY,

After leaving the Hall last evening I recognized from your description a young man whom I once knew. He was in the Army and all you said about his life was quite correct.

A. E. R. LANE.

CHAPTER III.

"SPIRIT" VISITANTS.

So far, the record of my public Clairvoyance has contained nothing, or very little, that is not frequently met with at similar meetings all over the world. But the phase that I now desire to lay before my reader is possibly a little less common. I have used the word "Visitants" to prevent confusion with the word Visitors, which is generally used to denote earthly callers.

My "Spirit" Visitants are those who come to me during various hours of the day or night. Sometimes they will come "at dead o' night" and wake me up; at other times they will come when I am alone in the tent in my garden, or in my drawing-room, or, what is still more obliging of them, they will "look in while passing," when I have earthly visitors with me, who can bear witness that I described the Visitant *to them*, before I went to the hall. I may say that *all* my Visitants have been recognized, a fact which makes them very real to me, and renders Telepathy inadequate as an explanation.

It was the custom of the Bournemouth

Society of Spiritualists, when I was an officer there, to give demonstrations of Clairvoyance after the service was over. Those members of the congregation who cared to do so were invited to remain for "an after-circle." This circle was about twenty-five feet in diameter and fully lighted by gas lamps. I mention this in order that the reader will better understand the words, "I announced from the platform." I used to announce the "Spirit" Visitants from the platform instead of during the "after circle," for two reasons—first, to show that I was not "seeing" the "spirit" at the time; and secondly, in case the person for whom the spirit came did not remain for the "after-circle." Much of the mental phenomena *may* be Telepathy, although I doubt if it is, for I consider it to be an over-stretched theory; but for a long time I accepted it, rather than admit an after-life. However, the events recorded in this chapter, particularly the last one, in which the Visitant was not recognized until two-and-a-half years had passed, have at least given me something to think about; and try how I will I cannot get Telepathy to cover the facts. The following story is quite true, but is too late to be vouched for by letter; nevertheless, I can refer the reader to Mr. Blake, the secretary of the local Society, who will confirm what I say.

On October 6, 1909, Mr. Blake called on me, and whilst we were talking I "saw" an Eastern "spirit" with a great knife sticking in his breast. I said to Mr. Blake that, although

I could not say for certain, I "felt" that it was the Pretender to the throne of Morocco, and that we should read about it in a day or two.

Three days later we read that the Pretender had been thrown to the lions by the Sultan, and that two soldiers had stabbed him in the breast with a large knife. This had happened on October 1, but the news was delayed until the 9th (*Daily Mail*). Here the reader will see two things. First, a "Spirit" Visitant that could not possibly be telepathed by Mr. Blake; second, a prophecy fulfilled within three days. Why, I ask, should the Pretender "telepath" to an obscure Englishman of whom he never heard? How, I ask, can Telepathy explain the visitation? To return to the subject.

On October 14, 1906, I gave nine descriptions, all of which were recognized. Eight were given in the "after-circle," and one was announced from the platform as a Visitant who had called on me under the following circumstances about four days before—

On the night of October 10 or 11, 1906, I lay in bed thinking, and was not even drowsy. Suddenly I became conscious that I was not alone. I saw a lovely woman enter my room, robed in white glittering garments, something like spangled muslin; in her hand was an ornament, such as is the Arum lily, and on her head was that which looked like a star or diamond. Her face was classical in its beauty. She bent over me and said: "I want you to describe me to a gentleman at the Hall on

Sunday. I come to you now as I cannot come then, because I am attached to a Home where we receive little children in our Sphere and nurse them, and on Sunday next I am 'in charge' there.* Take a good look at me, so that you will remember all details.''—(Of hair nose, eyes, mouth, age height, etc., etc.)

I said to myself: ''Look here, Turvey, you have got Spiritualism on the brain, and it is making you imaginative, and subject to delusions.''

The ''Spirit'' said: ''Oh no, I am not a delusion; do describe me. See! I change to earth clothes to make it easier.'' Then she seemed to go ''out'' like an electric lamp, and ''on'' again in an instant; but now she was in a sealskin jacket, a green skirt, patent leather boots, a toque with a feather and buckle. ''Look! this was a mannerism I had in picking up a book—this, another in opening a door.'' Here she showed me the mannerisms. (When I reproduced them, later on, they were recognized instantly—as was her description.) She said: ''Say to the gentleman: 'A flower—a book—a ring'.'' I did so on the following Sunday, and he said, ''Yes, the ring is actually in my house now.''

I append a letter proving that I described the ''spirit'' *before* the Sunday. The recognition is signed for in my book by three

* I cannot be held responsible for what ''spirits'' say to me, or for their wearing apparel. In this book I merely write of that which I have ''seen'' and ''heard.'' Those whose theories are upset by proved facts will kindly hold *me* excused.

witnesses, and I can produce the gentleman who knew the lady in Earth Life, if needed. I may add that the gentleman was unknown to me at the time.

(No. 18.)

Bournemouth,
June 5, 1907.

DEAR TURVEY,

I well remember calling on you about October 12 or 13, 1906, and you told me about the Visitant you'd had from the next world. You described it to me very minutely. On the Sunday, October 14, 1906, you repeated the description from the platform to a gentleman in the audience for whom the spirit came, and he recognized her immediately.

Yours truly,
JOHN WALKER.

On the night of (about) November 3, 1906, I was lying in bed, when, all of a sudden, a very peculiar "spirit" appeared by my bedside, Now, one side of my bed is only a few inches from the wall, and it was on *that* side my Visitant appeared, so he was partly *in* the wall. Let me again remark that, in spite of other visits, I said to myself, "Turvey, you're going off your head." The "spirit" looked at me for a time, and then spoke in this manner: "Well young man, I want you to take a good look at me, and shout my description from the platform next Sunday. Just look at my small round face pitted with small-pox—my dark, piercing eyes—my white duck suit and big sun hat."

"No," I said, "I'm not going 'to shout

your description out.' Who are you? Who do you come for? How do I know you're not hoaxing me?''

''Look here, young man, never you mind who I come for. I'm a funny looking card, and there're only two persons in this town who *could* recognize me. You just say you saw me, and they'll quickly recognize me—there can be no 'mix up' with anybody else.''

I took a good look at him; he certainly *was* a ''character''—once seen never forgotten. After a moment or two he said—

''See here, if there *is* any doubt at all, just to clinch up things a bit, tell the lady who recognizes me that the last time we met we had a bit of a row. It was like this. I saw her come galloping on horseback across my grounds, jumping my fences like a mad woman. She came straight up to the gate I was near, and I shut it in her face. She didn't say a word, but had the cheek to jump it and ride away. I was a bit wild and 'waited' for her. When she returned she explained things to me and we made it all square.'' I decided to give the description and incident on the Sunday following, at our hall, to the audience and ''chance it.'' Directly I had finished doing so, a lady rose in the audience and acknowledged that the description was correct, and the incident true in every detail. He was a ''squatter'' on the next ''station'' to her husband's. One of her servants had been bitten by a snake, and she had had to ride for a doctor. To save

time she had trespassed on his land, and had jumped the gate. When she returned she saw him, and explained her reasons, "and made things square."

The above is signed for as "recognized" in my note-book. I have no proof that it was a *Visitant*, beyond my own statement. The lady was a visitor to Bournemouth and a perfect stranger to me at the time.

The next incident is so explicitly set forth in the following letter, that words from me would be superfluous—

(No. 19.)

Bournemouth,
Feb. 12, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

In reply to yours of yesterday's date referring to my visit on Sunday afternoon last, I willingly bear witness to the fact you mention, viz., that on Sunday last, between 4 and 5 p.m. you described to me (but not *for* me) the spirit of a young sailor who had been drowned in a warm part of the ocean (Indian or African); you also said he was walking about the larger part of your double drawing-room (we were sitting in the smaller part). You also thought he was intended for some one in the Hall where you were going to give Clairvoyance at 8 p.m. that night. I mentioned it to Mr. Hiscock on Monday morning, and he told me it was recognized by a gentleman in the Hall. It is past my ken. I only know what I write is true.

With kind regards, etc.,
H. HEAL.

On February 12, 1908, I was driving on the New Undercliff Drive at Bournemouth,

and I passed a lady whom I recognized as being one of our audience or congregation. Behind her walked the "spirit form" of an old man with a brown (oak?) stick. I noted him "for future use."

On the Sunday following (February 16), before I began to give Clairvoyance, I asked the lady, who was present, "Did you see me drive past you last Wednesday?" She said, "Yes." Then I told her about the "spirit" I had seen behind her, and asked her if she recognized it. She replied that she did. This is signed for in my note-book.

On Saturday, March 14, 1908, the "spirit form" of a tall naval lieutenant walked into my drawing-room. He stayed long enough for me to notice his height, hair, eyes, nose, mouth, complexion, uniform, etc., etc., and to show me a wreath with "H.M.S." on it—to tell me he died a "funny *stiff sort of death*"—and also that he last saw the person for whom he came in September, 1893. When he had gone, I thought, "I will announce him from the platform to-morrow, and if that date is correct it will be a good test of identity."

When I announced him the next day there was no response from the audience. However, I did not despair, for, indeed, up to now my Visitants have never failed me, and even my "ordinary descriptions" generally get recognized either at the time or later on in the week.

After the service and circle were over I drove home, and had hardly finished supper

before the telephone bell rang, and a lady informed me that a friend of hers who was staying with her, but who *had not been at the hall*, had recognized the sailor Visitant immediately my informant had repeated the description to her at the supper table. And what is more, the *date*, September, 1893, was the last time she saw him alive. He had called to show her his new uniform that month.

I append an extract from the lady's letter confirming my statement—

(No. 20.)

Bournemouth,
Mar. 16, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

. . . . Also the description you gave from the platform was recognized by my friend, Miss B——, as a friend of hers who was in the Navy. The peculiarity about his death was that he flung himself from the masthead on to the deck, and was *picked up stiff immediately* after the fall.

Yours truly,
A. E. F. LANE.

As regards the date given, the husband of the above writer writes me as follows—

(No. 21.)

Mar. 20, 1908.

She now remembers that it was in September, 1893, that she last saw him; so again you prove how accurately you get things.

Yours truly,
F. E. LANE.

Before passing on to the next case of Spirit Visitants I think I must make a slight digres-

sion. The reader, if at all critical, may say, "How comes it that the lady in the hall should repeat the description of the naval lieutenant to her friend; it is not a usual thing to do?" The reason is as follows: On February 9, 1908, I gave the lady a description that she did not recognize; and, as is my usual custom, told her to remember it and try and see if she could recognize it later on. The following letter gives the result, and at the same time shows why she remembered the description of the Naval lieutenant, *i.e.* in case her *friends* might know him.

(No. 22.)

Bournemouth,
Feb. 22, 1908.

DEAR SIR,

At the Spiritualist Meeting in the Avenue on February 9, you described a young man who passed over some years ago. You said, "He was in the Army and had been abroad, and his name was a short name like Rob or Tom." I could not remember him at all, but later recollected that an uncle died in the Soudan War. His name I could not remember, as when I saw him I was only five years of age.

On the 10th I wrote to an aunt of mine who lives in London, and gave her the description you had given me.

Yesterday (21st) I received her answer, which I have copied from the letter.

"Now about the Spiritualist meeting you tell me about. It is very strange, but you have given me an exact description of my brother Tom, who died in the Soudan. You saw him when you were about five years of age."

I may add that my husband and a friend have seen my aunt's letter. Yours truly,

A. E. R. LANE.

On Tuesday, March 10, 1908, a "spirit" visited me, and I described him to two earthly visitors; but he was not for them, so I said, "I will announce him next Sunday." One of my visitors *thought* Mr. Hartley knew him. On the Sunday (March 15, 1908) before "announcing" the naval lieutenant of the last incident, I announced the following Visitant: "A young man, age, —; height, —; build, —; hair, —; eyes, —; nose, —; complexion, —, etc., etc." Then I went on to say "he often wore pink (not white) linen shirts, and sometimes let his cuffs get rather dirty, as he did not like to risk injuring a pair of cuff-links that he valued. He was an exceptionally fine musician, especially on the organ and piano. He was unfortunately easily led by companions. He gave me part of a name, but I could not get it all. What I did "get" was 'HAR'. Does any one know him?"

A gentleman in the Hall immediately rose and said he knew the young man, and that the description and details were perfectly correct in every way. Then I said to the gentleman, "Thank you, sir! Now perhaps you will understand the request he made to me, which was, 'Do let me materialize, old chap; it is so nice to come back to earth'." The gentleman replied, "That is quite plain to me, and is an exceedingly good test, because a few days ago that spirit *did* materialize to me and my friend Mr. Munday here" (sitting with him), "who also knew him in earth-life, at a seance in London."

The above incident I consider to be a very satisfactory proof of a Visitant. I have two witnesses to testify that I described him on Tuesday the 10th; two witnesses who *knew* him and recognized him on Sunday the 15th, and sixty witnesses that he *was* recognized. One strange thing is the name. I only "got" HAR. The "*spirit's*" name was HAR-ker. And the gentleman for whom he came, is named *HAR*-tley.

I append brief letters from the four people concerned, and in addition to these I have my note-book signed by four officers of the local Society, as mentioned in the Voucher.

(No. 23.)

Bournemouth,
Mar. 31, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

For the second time when I have been calling upon you have you given a description of some one unknown to me.

On this occasion (March 10, 1908) you described a young man, a musician, or at any rate, one very fond of music. You said he wore a pink shirt, the cuffs of which were rather soiled, and fastened with gold sleeve-links. You were able to get three letters of his name, *i.e.* "HAR." You also said he was most anxious to materialize. As neither the lady, who was also present, nor myself, were able to recognize your description, you said you would repeat it at your meeting the following Sunday. I am glad to hear that your description was then recognized. . . .

Yours sincerely,
T. H. LONSDALE.

(No. 24.)

Bournemouth,
April 7, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I was present at your house on March 10, 1908, when you described as a spirit a young man who played the organ, wore pink shirts, and wanted to tempt you to let him materialize.

In haste,
M. C. DICKENSON.

(No. 25.)

Bournemouth,
April 6, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

In reply to your request, I bear witness that I clearly recognized, from your description on Sunday, March 15, the young man who was musical, wore pink cuffs, and valued the cuff-links given to him, and who was named "*Harker*." I also understood his reference to materialization, he having some short time previous materialized to me at a séance at London. He died in my house last July. Mr. Munday, who was with me, also recognized the description.

Yours fraternally,
T. HARTLEY.

(No. 26.)

Poole,
April 4, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

In reply to yours, I, too, as well as Mr. Hartley, knew *Harker*, and saw him materialize at a séance held in London, on March 4, 1908, hence I at once recognized the description you gave of him from the platform (as a Visitant to you during the week) on Sunday, March 15, 1908. He was the "musical young man" who, you said, wanted you to let him materialize. I consider the description you gave of him was very good.

Yours truly,
H. MUNDAY.

The following extracts from letters are also concerning "Spirit" Visitants, but were not for people in the Hall. I think my reader will see, by now, that to attempt to explain the incidents by Telepathy is really futile.

(No. 27.)

Bournemouth,
June 5, 1907.

DEAR SIR,

On November 26, 1906, I attended a séance and obtained a message. I was told to call and see you; as the "spirit" informed me he had just visited you and you had described him and got his name.

The next day, on my way to see you, I met you in the company of another gentleman, and you said to me (before I spoke), "You have come to see me about a spirit who came to me at nine o'clock last night; his name is G—— C——," and his description you then gave most accurately, and stated that he died abroad in a very warm climate, such as India. He really died in China. I then produced a photo of him which I had obtained from his daughter, and you at once remarked, "Yes, that is he." I may say there were ten persons present when I received the message, among whom was *Councillor* E——, Mr. B——, etc., who would be able to corroborate the facts.

Yours truly,
T. P. STEVENS.

(No. 28.)

Bournemouth,
Jan. 30, 1908.

MY DEAR MR. TURVEY,

When I called on you on the 22nd inst. with my wife, you gave us a very clear description of a naval officer in a dress about the time of the Georges. We were unable to recognize him and I suggested the dress might be military, not naval. You insisted,

however, that the man had had a command at sea.

I am very glad that Lord R—— was able to recognize him.

Yours truly,
T. H. LONSDALE.

Two days after the visit of the above writer, Lord R— and the Hon. Mrs. H. Ellis called on me, and with them came the same Naval "Spirit." I described him to them, and append the Hon. Mrs. H. Ellis's letter as proof of recognition.

(No. 29A.)

London,
Feb. 8, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

You will remember describing a spirit to Lord R——; he could not recognize it at the time, but afterwards it struck him that it must be an ancestor of his, the *Earl of* "B'ankshire." You showed me a letter [that printed above—V.N.T.] from a friend in which the same spirit was described by you a day or two before, showing it could not have been Telepathy.

Yours,
H. ELLIS.

The following letter appeared in *Light* for September 25, 1909. I submitted the evidence to the Editor, as the reader will see by the Editor's footnote; therefore there is no need to reproduce it here.

AN ORIENTAL "SPIRIT" IDENTIFIED.

SIR,

In September, 1905, an Oriental in spirit form appeared to me and said three words in some native dialect. On October 7, 1905, in *Light*, I asked your

readers for a translation of them in order that I might see if the experience was more than a mere delusion. To my surprise some one wrote and told me that the words meant "Oh man, thy coat (or covering)," and might be used in order to draw attention to a rug on the floor. I set it down as genuine, but very trivial. For the sake of brevity we will call the Oriental a "Guru" (teacher). Early in April, 1907, I was again visited by this Guru. He was accompanied by a majestic Oriental, over six feet in height, broad-chested, well-made, with a complexion as fair as that of a dark Englishman. He had a long white beard, and on his chest a mystic symbol. We will call him "the Master." He spoke to the Guru in reference to my health, saying, "Life in the animal yet" (a sentence I had to get translated by an Anglo-Indian colonel).

I wondered why they came to *me*, a man likely to die at any moment. On April 6, 1907, the description was printed in *Light*. Once or twice I have seen this Master since his first visit, and on one occasion (August, 1908), Miss McCreadie saw him in my drawing-room, but could say no more than "Oh, what a man! Oh, what a handsome man!" A gentleman has also seen him with me. So far there is little proof that he is not a "self-created delusion." But on August 18, 1909, nearly two-and-a-half years after his description was printed in *Light*, the Master was recognized *from that description*, with a few more details, by an Oriental gentleman (whom I met quite casually on a yacht) as having been his own great grandfather, a distinguished military chief who is still venerated by his countrymen. On August 23, that gentleman, whom we will call Mr. X. (as his name must in no way appear, owing to professional and family reasons), dined with me, and after some music we began to talk about the Master. I said, "He rarely comes here, so don't be expectant." However, the Master did come, and with him came the Guru. They spoke to me in their language, and I

repeated it as best I could. To my amazement it was correctly given so as to be understood by Mr. X., and the words were quite to the point. The Guru gave his name and mentioned the place where he defeated the English troops and his body was buried. The connection between the Master and the Guru is that the latter was a pupil of the former's son, who was, of course, my Oriental visitor's grandfather. And what is more, they also gave a correct description of another relative and the native name of the military rank he holds.

In my letter in *Light* of October 7, 1905, I stated that "I know no language except English and school-boy French." I refer to that because if I said it now it might be considered by the sceptic as "said for effect." I heard the dialect by clairaudience, and repeated it consciously, as I was not entranced.

I have sent you letters received from various people, showing that I have often had "spirit Visitants" come to me a day or two before their earthly relatives have received and recognized the description, either privately or at the hall of the local Society. Some sceptics may say that the people knew they were coming to see me, and telepathed the descriptions to me in advance. This is absurd, for some of the people were entire strangers who had never heard of me, and if they had they could not be sure of seeing me, on account of my precarious health. But this case, I consider, is a "smasher" for Telepathy; for the description printed two-and-a-half years ago in *Light* was not recognized until August 18 of this year by Mr. X., who had only recently heard of me. I admit that I took the Master to be still in the body; this I think was due to the fact that he was an Adept in his religion, who frequently left the body while on earth, and who therefore would be less likely to show signs of death than an ordinary spirit.

Mr. X. informed me that the native dress is much as it was two hundred years ago, that the people still worship at the Master's tomb, and that both Master

and Guru are known throughout Islâm. This is not only a blow to Telepathy, but it shows how much may arise out of a mere trivial sentence like "Pick up your covering"; for it is, in fact, a proof of survival of bodily death.

Yours, etc.,

VINCENT N. TURVEY.

Bournemouth.

[We have seen letters confirming Mr. Turvey's statements as to "spirit" Visitants in advance of sitters, the recognition of "the Master" by "Mr. X.," and the fact that Mr. Turvey first met the latter gentleman in August of this year.—ED., *Light*.]

CHAPTER IV.

LONG-DISTANCE CLAIRVOYANCE.

When planning this book I included the following incidents in Chapter I. I now make a separate chapter of them for two reasons.

1. They are not Mental-body-travelling cases as "I" did not appear to leave "Me," ; at the same time they are "distant from the house," and therefore can hardly be classed as "Ordinary Clairvoyance."

2. There are more cases than at first I thought there were among my letters of evidence.

(No. 30.)

Bournemouth,
Feb. 22, 1904.

Dear Mr. Turvey,

I am perfectly willing to substantiate the following events—

Towards the beginning of 1903, I called at your house as regards the re-wiring* of the house you had just purchased. Somehow the conversation got on to the mysterious; you stated you had certain gifts, and I expressed my desire to make a test. You immediately informed me, although I was an absolute stranger to you, that I was a married man, and had

* This phrase applies to the installation of electric light, and *not* to a "secret Marconi system," as might be supposed by those who have read "Psychic Phenomena" by Mr. Carrington.

one child, a son, whose name you gave me in full. You correctly described the greater part of my house and furniture, and also described my wife, particularly mentioning a certain sort of purse she carried. You then went on to inform me that I had that morning been considerably bothered by the mislaying of certain books in the office. In a moment or two you told me that my mother was living in Glasgow; you described the interior and exterior parts of the house, particularly mentioning an old sword that was hanging on the wall, and stated, quite correctly, that this sword was used by one of my ancestors on the heights of Quebec under Wolfe. You even added: "Your mother is lying ill, and I am sorry to tell you she is suffering from one disease and is being medically attended under misapprehension for another." This I subsequently found to be correct by having a consultation. You also gave me a long and detailed account of my brother's life, and you told what was probably his exact occupation at the time of speaking, that is to say, he was gold-mining in Alaska.

Yours, etc.,
J. ALLAN.

In the above letter there is at least one thing which can hardly be explained by Telepathy; that is, the statement—"Your mother is suffering from one disease and being treated for another." I did not like to say *dying*, although "I" felt that such was the case. Consultation showed that the poor lady was dying from cancer, and had been treated for sciatica. It is this point that, in my opinion, completely puts Telepathy, as an explanation, out of court. Here, in Bournemouth, am I, an *unqualified* layman; and yet in some way or other I was able to obtain medical information about a woman right up in Glasgow.

Evidently, *no one on earth* knew of the error in diagnosis. Certainly the son did not, and therefore I could not have read *his* thoughts; certainly the poor patient could not have known; and even if she had, she could not telepath to a man of whose very existence she was ignorant. Obviously the doctor in attendance did not know of his error; and, if his "subconscious mind" knew, he could not telepath to me, for he, too, did not know of me. One should bear in mind that the son of the patient was a perfect stranger to me; and that he had merely called as the representative of a business firm.

The evidence is irrefutable. The certificate of death shows cancer to have been the cause of death; the prescriptions, that sciatica was being treated; the consultant was called in *after* I had spoken to the son. The young man is an honest, truthful, business man, and he writes a plain straightforward letter, because he knows the facts are true, although he cannot explain them any more than I can.

The following "extracts" are the result of a newspaper controversy:—

In January, 1903, *The Daily Mail* opened its columns to a discussion on "Pre-cognition," and I wrote stating that I believed the *recognizing* of a place which we had never seen before was due to our unconsciously having been there in "spirit-body" whilst the physical body lay asleep. I added that I had this faculty of travelling in the "spirit-body," and that not only when asleep.

As my name and address appeared I received several requests for demonstrations of the faculty. Being ill at the time I was unable to reply to more than five or six people. The following are the results of the tests.

A "Mr. J—— W——" of Lancashire wrote asking if I could tell him the cause of certain unpleasantness in his family.

(No. 31.)

On February 1, 1903, he wrote me: "It is astonishing to me that you have hit on one of the most important facts of my life."

(No. 32.)

"Mr. ——" of London writes, on February 4, 1903: "You write to me about a dark man with a black moustache, slightly curly hair, age forty-two, greatly worried at present about some new plans he is preparing for his business, he writes with a black pen-holder, on a leather-topped writing-table with turned legs, and two drawers. *This gentleman is connected with me.*"

On February 9, 1903, Dr. D—— H—— called for a "test," and I said to him: "You have been using a large book bound in green, as your chief reference whilst writing a treatise, or article; there is a pile of manuscript on your writing-table, the object of which is to convey knowledge of a scientific description. Furthermore, a young lady (of whom I gave him a good description) has been helping you with the work in hand."

On February 29, in reply to my asking him

to give me a letter confirming the above, he writes as follows—

(No. 33.)

". . . I can do nothing without the consent of the lady, as regards signing the paper you kindly sent, I think it would be better to delay doing so until after I have seen you again. I can do nothing without the consent of the lady, who is now out of Bournemouth."

Comment on the above is needless. It will give the reader a faint idea of some of the difficulties against which I have had to contend while trying to obtain evidence.

(No. 34.)

Mar. 5, 1903.

DEAR SIR,

"I must say you are quite correct regarding my appearance and disposition as far as it goes, except that my eyes are blue, not hazel. I am, as you say, five feet nine inches in height, fair, slight moustache, palé face, long white hands, and other particulars are correct. You are wrong in the description of my father, but *quite right* in that of my mother. You state that I once thought of going abroad—I have been twice round the world. I have, as you say, studied a great deal. You are quite correct about my weakness for nice clothes. . . ."

Yours truly,

REGINALD B. SPAN.

The next incident places another difficulty in the way of those who would try to explain all these phenomena by Telepathy. It is a case of lost property being restored by means of long-distance Clairvoyance.

The argument that is most usually used by the Telepathy adherents in cases of the recovery of mislaid property by means of Clairvoyance is: "Oh yes! Mr. Careless put the book away and forgot where he had laid it. Mr. Clare Voyant merely read his subconscious mind." The reader will see the fallacy of that argument in *this* case. The books were received by the owner's *partner* and put away by him while the owner was "on his holidays," and their resting place was forgotten by the one gentleman, and unknown to the other.

Messrs. Black and White are my lawyers. I say this because they are *not* lawyers, and are not named Black and White; but let it stand as a similar case. One day Mr. White, who is "my" man of the two, kindly lent me some catalogues. A few days after doing so he went away for his holidays, and I returned the books to Mr. Black. Months passed, and one day I was astonished to receive a letter from Mr. White asking "for the catalogues, if you have finished with them." I wrote and told him I had returned them long ago, and added "by Clairvoyance I can see them in an old mahogany bureau, at the back of the drawer, in a room, etc., etc."

(No. 35.)

Bournemouth,
Sept. 18, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Many thanks for your letter *re* catalogues. Much to my astonishment, I found the books in the old piece of furniture that you saw clairvoyantly. I am

sorry to have troubled you in the matter; but they were returned while I was away.

Thanking you for helping me to find them; for they were in a room you had not been in or seen.

Yours truly,
R—— U——.

The lady mentioned in the next incident was staying with us for a few months. One day, when talking on the subject of Clairvoyance, she asked me if I could describe her "father, or any one else at home." Her home is miles away from here, and I have never been near the place; I gave her the description of a man, and, as it appeared to be wrong, the matter was dropped. Some time after she had returned home she wrote a letter to my wife. She had made inquiries and had found the description, although wrong as regards any one *she knew*, was correct concerning a previous tenant about whom even her parents knew nothing.

(No. 36.)

Halesworth,
Sept. 1, 1907.

DEAR MRS. TURVEY,

. . . Mr. Turvey's description is quite right for a former resident in this house who lived here about twenty years ago. . . .

Yours very sincerely,
M. STANFORD.

The next two extracts are interesting because they bring in an "intelligence" other than my own. At least, I think so. The story, briefly, is as follows: A gentleman attended a séance many miles away from Bournemouth, and

through the table (or by other "occult" means) he was instructed to "go to Bournemouth for information." When he arrived here, he wrote to *Light*, and they told him to write to me, as I was then an official of the local Society. I replied, saying that I should be pleased to see him, and asked him if he were "five feet ten inches in height, wearing a grey jacket and waistcoat and odd trousers." I need hardly say he was as unknown to me as Adam. His letters follow:—

(No. 37.)

Boscombe,
Dec. 29, 1906.

DEAR SIR,

I enclose a letter from the secretary of the Spiritual Alliance, which I hope you will allow as an introduction for an interview with you on the subject of Spiritualism.

I was directed to come into Bournemouth for information, at a small sitting in the country.

Yours very sincerely,
(COLONEL) J—— H——.

(No. 38.)

Boscombe,
Dec. 30, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I am just five feet ten in my boots, and was wearing grey flannel jacket and waistcoat when I wrote the note to you; my trousers being of quite different material.

Again thanking you for your very kind response.

Yours very sincerely,
(COLONEL) J—— H——.

I was vice-president of the Bournemouth Spiritualist Society in 1908, and during that year the committee held their business meetings once a month at my house. On May 5, one of these meetings was to be held at 8 p.m. Between 6 and 7 p.m. I thought that I would try a little experiment in long-distance Clairvoyance, as I felt the peculiar sensation which denotes that the faculty is active. I retired into my drawing-room with the intention of trying to see what one or two of the members of the committee were doing. I was able to see three of the officials in different parts of the town, and wrote briefly on a sheet of paper what I "saw" each person doing. As I did not look at the clock I headed the paper "6.30 to 6.55," that being the time as nearly as I could estimate. A few minutes before eight o'clock I put my rough notes in an envelope, and placed it upon the committee room table. When the seven or eight members arrived, before beginning the business of the Society, I told them what I had done, and asked each of the three members whom I had seen (clairvoyantly) to kindly tell me what they had been doing between 6.30 and 7 p.m. that evening.

Each of them made a brief statement. The envelope was opened; and, as the notes therein contained were found to accurately agree with the statements made, each of the three members concerned, in the presence of the others, appended their signatures, as will be

seen in the following document, which is a certified copy of the rough notes which were in the envelope.

(No. 39.)

May 5, 1908.—"Marrington,"—Time 6.30 to 6.55 p.m.

"I saw"—(1) Mrs. Laney standing with letter or paper in her hand, rather put out and annoyed, she waits for some one to come in and then she turns round quickly, as if she said: "What do you think about this?"

(2) Mr. F. T. Blake sitting at, or leaning on a desk, opposite to a window, light thrown on desk, with a long dark book—back bound in leather—he is writing and says to some one, "I'm busy for a minute or two" or words to that effect.

(3) Broad-shouldered gentleman, Mr. Walker or Mr. Luckham, is taking a few steps, with something in his hands that keeps them about twenty inches apart, as would a bowl or box. He is in shirt sleeves."

We severally sign for the correctness of the above statements as far as we are each personally concerned.

G. J. LUCKHAM.
F. T. BLAKE.

With the exception of ten minutes in time.

FLORENCE LANEY.

In paragraph (3) of the above the reader will notice that I had written "Mr. Walker *or* Mr. Luckham." The reason of my inability to discriminate between the two gentlemen, who are *both* broad-shouldered men, was the fact that I saw only the back of the person in my clairvoyant vision.

The following incident needs little or no explanation. Mr. Walker had lately moved

into a new house, and I had tried to see by Clairvoyance what the house was like; because, at that time, I was unable to go there in the usual way of paying a call, owing to my state of health. This will explain why Mr. Walker's postcript is so definite.

(No. 40.)

Poole,

April 29, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I called on you on April 27, 1908, and you drew a correct plan of the lower front part of my house. You also correctly placed the furniture in my dining-room, as well as door, window and fireplace. The only mistake you made was, you said oval table, whereas it is square. We have *two* places for the table, one is against the wall, the other is in the centre of the room. This is for when the table is in and out of use. Now you sketched the table as oval in the centre of the room, and where the table stands when *not* in use you correctly sketched its shape, but mistook it for another piece of furniture. Had you not drawn it in the centre as oval, your description would have been singularly exact, as you marked out its two positions and in one its correct shape.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN WALKER.

P.S.—(May 18, 1908.)

I may add for the satisfaction of those who doubt these facts, that you have never been in our house or neighbourhood.

J. W.

CHAPTER V.

PHONE-VOYANCE.

HAVING in the Introduction explained what I mean by the above word, I proceed, without further preamble, to lay the facts that led me to "coin a new word" before the reader.

On November 15, 1905, Mr. J. W. Sharpe rang me up on the telephone in order to ask a question concerning a lecture that was to be given at the local Society's Hall. When I had answered the inquiry he said, "I must go now, as I have a friend here." I replied, "Yes, I see you have." He said, "You don't mean to say that you can see who it is?" I said, "No! I cannot see *who* he is, but I can describe him to you." I then proceeded to accurately describe the gentleman's face, hair, eyes, hands, stature and moustache, etc., and added, "he wants a shave." I mentioned that he was sitting in an armchair with his legs crossed, and one arm on the arm of the chair. While this description was being given Mr. Pontifex, for that is the name of Mr. Sharpe's visitor, rose from the chair and went and leaned on the mantelpiece with one elbow, standing up to do so, with his legs crossed. I described his move-

ments to Mr. Sharpe. In order to make the "test" even more convincing, I asked Mr. Sharpe to tell Mr. Pontifex to pick up a book at random (I knew the telephone was in Mr. Sharpe's library) and to hold it in such a position that Mr. Sharpe could not see it, and therefore could not "telepath" its description to me. This was done, and I correctly stated the size of the book, the colour of the binding, that the lettering was in gold at the back, and that "although it is in English it is in some way connected with something foreign." As a matter of fact it was an English translation of a German work on philosophy.

After that, Mr. Pontifex came to the telephone and asked for further demonstration. The ability to "see" was fast slipping away from me; but I was able to describe one or two more articles to him, such as his own watch, and a cigarette-case in his pocket. He then cross-questioned me, in order to find out if I had seen him before, if I had ever heard him described, etc. His letter shows that I was able to convince him that I had never even heard of him.

There is one very remarkable thing about the incident, and I have purposely "left it till last" as the children say. In describing Mr. Pontifex to Mr. Sharpe, I said, "He is wearing, on his waistcoat, an oblong ornament; it is not made of silver or gold, but is of a brownish metal, such as is bronze."

The extraordinary thing about this is that

he was not wearing it *at the time*, but he frequently *does* wear it. The ornament was at his own house, two or three miles away from Mr. Sharpe's house, and yet I distinctly saw the thing on his waistcoat at the time he was sitting in Mr. Sharpe's library. I cannot explain why or how I saw it *there*. I only know that I *did* see it, in a place "where it wasn't," if I may be pardoned the paradox.

I now append letters from the two gentlemen concerned, which will enable the reader to verify my statements. I trust it is unnecessary to add that Mr. Sharpe in *no way* gave me any information as regards Mr. Pontifex's appearance or his movements.

(No. 41.)

Bournemouth,
Nov. 15, 1905.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Your descriptions this afternoon were as follows—

1. As to Mr. Pontifex, that he was sitting in the, or in a, chair, with legs crossed, and one arm on the arm of the chair, and afterwards standing with legs crossed, and wearing an oblong metal, brownish, and not of gold nor of silver, something on his waistcoat. (This last particular was incorrect at the time, but could be accurately referred to a badge which he does at times wear.)

2. An accurate description of his hands and of his features, of his moustache, and adding the fact that he was in want of a shave (which was true), and giving his stature correctly.

3. He took a book out of a shelf behind me, and I remained in ignorance of the book until your description came to an end. You correctly stated its colour, and that the lettering was in gold upon the back, and

that it was a book written in English about something foreign. It was, in fact, a treatise in English upon the philosophy of Kant.

Faithfully yours,
J. W. SHARPE (M.A.).

P.S.—I ought to add that you communicated with Mr. Pontifex and myself by telephone, and that the distances between our two houses is nearly a mile.

The following letter is from Mr. Pontifex. He does not give many details, because I showed him the previous letter. However, he backs up the chief facts, and that is what is required.

(No. 42.)

Bournemouth,
Nov. 22, 1905.

DEAR SIR,

I am willing to testify that, although I was absolutely unknown to you (you never having seen me, or, as far as I know, even heard of me), while speaking to our mutual friend, Mr. SHARPE, by telephone, it being dark at the time, at a distance of about one mile, I being in the room alone with him at the time you were speaking to him, you were able to see me (apparently) as you described my personal appearance in great detail (to him), and were able to follow my movements about the room, even mentioning the articles I picked up or touched, such as describing accurately my watch, also a book which I chose at random out of a book-case in the room containing hundreds of volumes; Mr. Sharpe not knowing what the book was until you described it to him by telephone.

(Signed) C. V. PONTIFEX.

On May 11, 1907, Mr. Pontifex rang me up on the telephone and asked if he could introduce a gentleman, who was "interested in

psychic matters.'' I said that I should be very pleased, and upon that Mr. Donkin came to the instrument to converse with me. After we had exchanged a few sentences, I said, ''Wait a bit. Excuse me, are you a tall man with a black moustache?'' He laughed, and said, ''Oh no, I am short and nearly white.'' I replied, ''That does not matter; it is someone your end of the line whom I can see; so will you listen to the description and then try to 'place it'?'' When the description came to an end Mr. Donkin said, ''Well that is funny! I have just been talking to such a man, and he is in the room next to this. I am at his house.'' Mr. Pontifex, being in the room, overhead the recognition, and I append this letter, which is a continuation of Letter No. 14A, Chapter I.

(No. 14B.)

Bournemouth,
May 13, 1907.

'' . . . I also witness the fact that you described, through the telephone, a gentleman actually in the house I was in at the time, but not in the room, to another gentleman who was talking to you while I I was standing near him at the telephone. This is the second occasion you have described some one through the telephone to my knowledge.

''Yours, etc.,
''C. V. PONTIFEX.''

Thanks to the courtesy of Mr. Donkin, I am enabled to print a very explanatory letter, the value of which is enhanced by the fact that he allows me to use his name, which is one that is highly respected in Bournemouth. The

particular value of his letter is due chiefly to the precise manner in which he makes his statements. He makes it clear that he and Mr. Pontifex were strangers, and had met at their host's house; that Mr. Pontifex rang *me* up; that he (the writer) was *then* introduced to me; and that Mr. Pontifex gave me *no* information, concerning their host's appearance at the time; and that he could not have done so previously as he had not met him till then. Had I described Mr. Donkin himself, a critic might say that I knew him, as he is a well-known man in Bournemouth; but it was the *host* whom I described; and up to the present time I have not seen him (in the ordinary way), and do not even know who he is or where he lives.

(No 43.)

Bournemouth,
May 1, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Referring to our introduction and subsequent chat through the telephone some little time back, I think you might take the following account as representing the actual facts of the case. About a year ago, I happened to meet a Mr. Pontifex at the house of a mutual friend in this town. After a little conversation on general matters, your name was mentioned and Mr. Pontifex rang you up and introduced me kindly to you through the instrument. When we had thus exchanged a few words, you asked me if I were a tall man with a dark moustache—I naturally laughed and said the description did not apply to me as I was short and my hair was "nearer white." You then went on with the description and I said that it would be correct if applied to our host, with

whom I had just been speaking, and who was in an adjoining room. Mr. Pontifex heard me admit the correctness of your description. I certainly did not inform you in any way where I was or who my host was or what he was like, neither did Mr. Pontifex, as far as I know (and we were both present at the instrument at the same time), but he merely introduced us and stood by while we spoke to each other.

Yours very truly,
J. DONKIN, F.R.I.B.A.

The following letter is so self-explanatory that it needs no comment from me, beyond mentioning the fact that I had heard of Mr. Lobb, but had not seen him.

(No. 44.)

Bournemouth,
Oct. 28, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I was this morning sitting in a mutual friend's house. He rang you up on the telephone and you replied (showing you were at home, I understand, a mile away).

After a little conversation, he told you I was in the room, and you then said you could "see a spirit friend" with me. You gave him a description of the spirit and he repeated it to me. I recognized it distinctly. This, I think, puts the so-called "explanation," thought reading, entirely on one side as not covering all the facts.

Yours truly,
JOHN LOBB.

The next incident is very peculiar in more ways than one. I must just remind the reader of the "brownish badge" that was not there at the time but was "sometimes worn" (the case of Mr. Pontifex, letter No. 41).

This time it is not only a badge, but a silver chain, football medal, and silver matchbox that were "seen" on a person who was *not* wearing them *at the time*, but who habitually wears them. And further than this, a young lady was seen to be with the gentleman at the other end of the telephone, although she was miles away from him, as was his silver chain, etc., at the time. I do not intend to attempt to explain this peculiar form of phenomena, but I feel that I must point out one strange thing about it. In this seeing of things that are *not there*, but were "habitually worn," there seems to be a great similarity to the seeing of old clothing on the "spirits" of the dead.

In this case Mr. Oaten could not have been wearing his silver chain, as it was actually in Bristol at the time that I "saw" it on him in Bournemouth. A "spirit" has also been seen "wearing a long gold chain" after the actual chain had been "divided into three parts and each of us three girls had a part given to us."* I say, therefore, that if a man, still in the body, can be seen to be wearing that which is not actually in his possession, then this goes a long way to prove that men out of the body can be seen wearing articles of clothing not actually in their possession. I think that the same law governs both phenomena; but what that law is I do not profess to know. Solve one problem and you will solve the other. A fair-minded critic is bound to admit that the "joke" about

* See Chapter II., "Public Clairvoyance" (date Feb. 9, 1908).

"the ghosts of clothes" has lost much of its value. I must admit that I am pleased to have "spotted" this similarity, for it opens up a vista, and gives food for thought.

I shall now relate the incident which led me to think more about "the brown ornament that was not there," in the case of Mr. Pontifex, than I should have done had it been a single isolated experience.

Mr. Ernest Oaten is a well-known speaker in the Spiritualistic Movement, and he was staying in Bournemouth for the week-end. His "everyday things" were naturally left at home in Bristol. He called on one of the members of the local Society, and that gentleman rang me up on the telephone and asked if I would like to say a few words to Mr. Oaten, as I had been unable to go to hear him lecture at the Hall on the previous day. I replied that I should be very glad to do so, and Mr. Oaten came to the telephone. After a few words I said: "This is very funny! I cannot see you, but I can see your watch chain quite clearly." He replied: "Will you describe it?" I did so, and added that it was made of silver, and that in the middle there was a football or cricket medal, and a silver matchbox at one end. "Well," he said, "I am wearing my gold chain now, and that has no match-box or medal; but what you have described is the one I habitually wear all the week when at work."

As I continued to "hold" the faculty I went on to describe a young lady to him, saying,

"She is not dead and is not actually with you, but you know her." Mr. Oaten said that this was true and that the description was a good one. I also described the "spirit" of an Arab with him; and was able to distinguish the "spirit" from the "picture" (of the young lady). Mr. Oaten in his letter forgets to mention that I correctly gave the number of letters in the lady's christian name, and also the actual letter with which her surname begins. It is interesting to note that, although I could distinguish between a "spirit" and the "picture" of a living person, yet I could not see that the silver chain was not *really* there, but was only a "picture." However all occultists know that silk, hair, and metals are not conducive to, but rather retard clairvoyant as well as "physical phenomena."

(No. 45.)

Bristol,
Mar. 31, 1908.

My Dear Mr. Turvey,

I must drop you a line to thank you for the description of a friend given me by you this morning on the telephone, which description I fully recognize. Though many friends have been described to me, this is the first instance in which I have received Clairvoyance over the 'phone. As stated by you, the lady is still in the body and her nose is her leading feature.

I must say the description is a very striking one and perfectly given. Thank you very much.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,
E. W. Oaten.

(No. 46.)

April 1, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

To my previous card may I add that I am (as far as I know) a complete stranger to you. We have never met. We were only speaking over the 'phone.

You also described a chain, medal, and matchbox of silver which I habitually wear when at work. This is strange, as I was wearing my *gold* one at the time (which has neither medal nor match-box) but I wear the silver one most.

You also described a spirit "Arab" with me. of this I can only say that two or three others have given me the same description.

With many thanks,

E. W. OATEN.

I insert a postcard from Mr. Hiscock, from whose premises the above writer spoke to me, showing that he rang me up and introduced Mr. Oaten. I do this in order to prove that I was not "in a house overlooking that of the person seen" as has been suggested by *very* acute critics. It proves that I must have been at home, and that Mr. Oaten was (at least three miles away) in Mr. Hiscock's shop.

(No. 47.)

April 4, 1908.

DEAR SIR,

I rang you up last Monday, March 30, and introduced Mr. Oaten to you who was in my shop. I understand you then gave him a description over the telephone.

Yours, H. HISCOCK.

In the next case it is necessary to state that I know both the young ladies. Their

father's letter merely vouches for what I saw, or said I saw, through the telephone, *i.e.*, what one was doing in the room above, and what the other's dress, etc., was like.

(No. 48).

Bournemouth,
May 17, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

On April 12 last I was speaking to you on the telephone, and it is important to remember that my instrument is on the ground floor. After concluding our conversation on the subject we were conversing about, you said that you could see my daughter RUBY in the room above, engaged in correspondence which seemed to be voluminous.

I must confess I was surprised to find that she was actually writing letters as you stated, and had a quantity of papers and correspondence spread out on the table around her. You also accurately described my younger daughter standing beside me at the telephone on the same occasion.

Yours truly,
D. HARTLEY.

The next letter hardly needs any remarks from me. Again Mr. Pontifex figures in the incident. It came about in this way. He rang me up and said: "I have some friends here, do you think you could 'see' anything for them?" It so happened that I could, and this is the only time I have been able to do it "at request." I replied "Yes, I see a spirit who comes for the tall lady in black who is with you." (This the reader will note is a "description" in itself, for I was not told that a lady was there at all.) The lady thereupon

came to the telephone and I gave her a description of the "spirit" form of a young man who was killed in the South African War.

Her letter is brief, but testifies as to the correctness of the vision sufficiently to justify the reader in believing my statement.

(No. 49.)

Bournemouth,
June 4, 1907.

DEAR SIR,

I was in a room with some mutual friends on May 22, 1907. Mr. Pontifex rang you up on the telephone and asked if you could "see" anything. You said "Yes, for a lady who is there," and he called me to the 'phone. I was and am a stranger to you. You described to me a young man I knew who was killed in the South African War, and gave details such as "he went to Eton" and "had a sister," etc.

Yours truly,
A— I— M——.

In order to understand the next incident the reader must be told that Mr. Hiscock has two places of business. I rang up the wrong one, and Mr. Hiscock was not there. When, a few days later on, he called to see me, I asked him if his manager was a "short, fair, etc., etc. man." He said, "Yes, he is." I said, "I saw him through the 'phone the other day, but you had better ask him if I *did* ring up; for, although you can say that I have correctly described him, you must get his word that I spoke to him on the telephone, or else some clever person will say that I got his description from you by Telepathy to-day." He asked his manager, and then wrote the following letter.

(No. 50.)

Bournemouth,
July 15, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

My manager says that you did speak with him on the telephone a day or two ago, and he has never seen you nor have you seen him. When I called on you on Sunday last, you said you had "rung him up" by mistake; and you described him exactly to me. You must therefore have seen him clairvoyantly, through the telephone. At any rate, I can see no other explanation of the phenomenon, as your health would not allow you to go to see him.

Yours,
H. HISCOCK.

In the next incident Mr. Hartley was talking to me on the telephone, and asked if I could "see anything." "Well," I said, "only a book about the size of a six shilling novel, maroon back, dark coloured sides, different in colour to the back, and the edges are speckled with pink spots. I also see, *connected* with the book, but not actually on it, a large 'P'." "Quite right," he replied, "the 'P' is the first letter of the owner's name." I saw that the "P" was *not* on the book, as I also saw that "the young lady still in the body" was not with Mr. E. W. Oaten. Can the reader say why I could not see that the "brownish ornament," and the "silver chain, medal, and match-box, "were *not* actually there"? If I could distinguish between "with you" and "connected with you" in *two* cases, why not in the other two cases? Both failures were with *metal* objects.

(No. 51.)

Bournemouth,
April 6, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Yes! I acknowledge that through the telephone you described correctly a book in my office and you added, "I see connected with it a 'P'." This is strange, as the name of the owner of the book began with that letter.

Yours,
D. HARTLEY.

The next incident is so well set forth in the letter that I need say nothing about it.

(No. 52.)

Boscombe,
April 24, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I was much impressed by the demonstration of 'Phone Clairvoyance you gave me yesterday. You certainly gave a good description of my private office, which you have never entered in your physical body. You stated you saw me then "sitting in front of a flat brown thing, which might be a sheet of brown paper—it was large and flat." At the moment I was seated at my writing-table, a dark brown wood three feet six inches by two feet three inches. You then proceeded to say on my right you saw what might be a picture frame, but you could see no picture, size about three feet square. As a matter of fact, on my right there is an old fashioned window two feet nine inches square. Then you asked, "What is that black thing at the back of your table, about two feet long and an inch thick? I don't think it is a ruler, but it might be from its size." Now this is most remarkable. My writing-table did not fit closely to the wall, and at times pens fell behind it. I therefore put an "odd man" on the premises to fill

in the cavity, which caused me some inconvenience. This was done very effectually, but not neatly, and at the back of my writing table may be easily seen a projection of *black* wood about an inch broad one way, two inches another (if looking down at it), and upon measuring the wood I find it is about thirty and a half inches in length. Your house being distant from my office about two miles, I think we may forgive the inches, the other is so accurate in detail. It gives me much pleasure to testify to this.

Yours faithfully,
FLORENCE LANEY.

The next case of Phone-voyance is clearly set out in the letter of testimony, and needs few, if any, remarks from me. I had some weeks previously lent a book to Mrs. F. Lane, and as another inquirer wanted to read it, I rang up Mr. Lane to ask him if she had finished with it. When he came to the telephone, I could distinctly see a long narrow passage, of which the dominant colours were brown and yellow. At the end of the passage, I could see a pair of hands, wrists and forearms, evidently those of a woman. These hands appeared to be busy in or around a bowl, in the manner in which one would expect them to be if the owner were shelling peas or washing her hands. The arms appeared to be bare, as if the sleeves were rolled up.

(No. 53.)

Bournemouth,
June 16, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

As my wife is not very well to-day, she asks me to write to you with reference to your Clairvoyance

through the telephone when you rang up yesterday.

You told her that she was standing at the end of a passage with yellow walls and brown linoleum on floor. As you have never been in the house or had it described to you it is quite impossible for you to have known these details, which are quite correct.

You also asked her if she had her sleeves turned up, and if, before she came to the telephone, she had her hands in a bowl of water or in a work-basket. The actual facts are that her sleeves came to the elbow with net cuffs, and that she got up from serving the sweets at the dinner-table, which were in two glass bowls.

With kind regards, etc.,

FRANK LANE.

CHAPTER VI.

PROPHECIES.

I DO not think there is a more peculiar fact in the realm of occultism than the fulfilled prophecy.

It is a matter of small surprise to me that the prophet in olden days was called a man of God; for prophecy seems to be a superhuman gift of power which transcends the mere normal faculties. All prophets are Seers, but all Seers are not necessarily prophets. The Bible says that when a prophet makes a prophecy we are to wait a little while, and if it comes true the prophet is a man of God; if not, !!!

Of course a modern prophet or Seer has a much worse time of it. Not only has he to put up with much abuse and slander, but, even if his prophecy be fulfilled, he is told "you never said it would happen." If he is able to produce good evidence, well! then! he is told that it is "mere coincidence," or "only a trivial thing that often happens" (like Japan beating Russia?); and at most it proves the prophet to be a man-of-the-devil, in the eyes of the modern Pharisee. But I do not claim to be a "prophet." My only claim is, that on

several occasions I have felt inspired to think, or to say, certain sentences which contained references to futurity; and that the events foretold have ultimately come to pass.

There is, however, another manner in which I have obtained, not only an intimation of events about to happen, but also verifiable information about those which have occurred. Although, to me, the following is an actuality, I do not desire the reader to accept it as a demonstrated fact, save in so far as it is a true statement of what *appears* to take place. I take it, however, that, if certain parts of a vision are found to be true, the remaining parts can hardly, with fairness, be considered to be the "wild speculations of a mere theorist." At certain times I see a sort of film or ribbon continually moving as does an endless belt or a cinematograph film. This film in colour is of a very, very pale heliotrope, and it seems to vibrate with great velocity. Upon it are numerous little pictures; some appear to be engraved on the film itself, others are like pale blue photographs stuck on to the film. The former I have found to refer to past events, the latter to those about to happen. The locality of the event is judged by scenery and climatic heat. I have to estimate dates by the clearness of the picture. The reader will notice many references to time in the following letters.

On May 18, 1902, I went to a sanatorium to recuperate my health. In the train I met a

gentleman whom I knew, and as he was an influential member of the Press, I said: "Do you want some early information for your paper? If it comes off it will be a boom for you." He laughed, and said: "Go ahead." I replied: "In 1903 England will be the ally of Japan; and in 1904-5 Japan will be at war with Russia." Unfortunately my letter to him, asking if he remembered the conversation, remains unanswered. I can therefore only offer my own word as evidence. I may say that the above statement was printed in a "big" Weekly, that the gentleman's name appeared (by accident on the part of their representative), and that the statement met with no denial from him.

Although unable to produce evidence for the last-mentioned prophecy, I can, by the merest chance, produce evidence that I foretold, in June, 1904, the result of the War. My correspondent is a well-known author.

There is a strange coincidence in connection with the letter which follows. On January 3, 1907, I happened to write to the editor of a paper saying that I had foretold that the terms of peace between Japan and Russia would be very easy. After the letter had been posted I remembered that I had no evidence with which to back up my statement. The next morning I received the following letter, furnishing me with evidence. It was written on the same day as was my letter to the editor, and, what is more extraordinary, it was a *three-years'-belated* reply to one of my letters.

(No. 54.)

Lancashire,
Jan. 3, 1907.

MY DEAR TURVEY,

You may imagine how horror-struck I was yesterday to find your most kind letter of June 3, 1904, lying hidden in a pile of old letters, and unanswered. . . It was a most extraordinary prediction that you made in regard to the Japanese terms of Peace. You said that their demands would stagger humanity by reason of their mildness. Strange to say your prediction came absolutely true. I kept a note of it in my mind, and your letter has also reminded me of your prophecy.

Yours sincerely,
J—— W——.

In the above letter, the reader will see that the event foretold was not a trivial one of daily occurrence. In 1902 Japan was looked upon as a mere barbarous state by the average untravelled "man in the street," and nobody expected Russia to suffer defeat at the hands of its little neighbour.

(No. 55.)

London, W.,
Feb. 20, 1904.

DEAR SIR,

I distinctly remember that almost in the early stages of the recent South African War you foretold, in spite of the general public opinion, that the war would last three years, would take 250,000 men to bring it to a climax, and that the Queen (Victoria) would not live to see the finish of it. And you also said the coronation of the King will not take place.* Neither did it as arranged.

R—— B——.

* This refers to the coronation as originally arranged.

The above letter needs no comment. The one following only needs a reference to letter No. 12, Chapter I., "information . . . which time will verify." It has done so.

(No. 56.)

Bournemouth,
June 15, 1907.

DEAR SIR,

In February, 1906, you foretold the sudden death of my husband within a year. I enclose you papers giving an account of his death, which will confirm your prediction, as he died suddenly in his office last January, *i.e.* eleven months after your prophecy (which is within the year).

You are at liberty to use his name and my name as you think fit.

Yours faithfully,
C. DICKENSON.

The following extract also contains a prophecy of death; and a "warning" that I have reason to think saved a life of great value. The other half of the letter is in Chapter III., "Visitants"; letter, No. 29A.

The reader is reminded that rhododendrons "come out" in May.

(No. 29B.)

London, S.W.,
Feb. 8, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

It was truly marvellous that the carriage accident you prophesied would happen to me actually took place a few months afterwards, both at the time of day, and the place you mentioned.

Also that you said my sister-in-law, the Duchess,

"would die before the Rhododendrons were out." And she actually died in April.

Yours truly,
H. ELLIS.

As regards the next letter it is necessary to point out that I made the prophecy and "saw" the smudge on the envelope on June 4. The postmark shows that the envelope was not posted until June 10. The inference is that, as the letter came from a big business firm, that particular envelope was unsoiled, and not even out of its packet, at the time I made the prophecy. The following letter omits to mention the date on the envelope; but, as it is on view with all the other letters, any one who cares to do so may see that the postmark is that of June 10, 1907.

(No. 57.)

Bournemouth,
June 14, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

We called to see you on the 4th inst. and you said: "I see a letter coming from the North, about Newcastle, for you." We replied that we did not expect one, and then we remembered that Mr. B—— (senior) had written to a firm there and he *might* get a reply. You said: "Oh, yes, I see the letter, and you will find a funny sort of smudge on the back of the envelope."

This has come true, and we have sent you the envelope for *you to see the smudge on the back*.

Yours truly,
S. BUMSTEAD.
H. BUMSTEAD.

The two next letters show that the prophecies were actually being fulfilled "at home" at the time they were being made to my visitor. (The second is towards the end of the longer letter: "When I arrived home I found a letter, etc.") These cases are clearly those of "information unknown to anyone present," as indeed are all the prophecies.

(No. 58.)

Bournemouth,
June 15, 1907.

DEAR SIR,

I write to say that the gentleman you described to me this evening with the "Scotch Influence" actually called on my mother, while I was with you this evening, and answers the description you gave exactly.

Yours,

M—— L——.

(No. 59.)

Kinson,
June 2, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I am willing to bear witness to the following facts. On February 15 of this year I called to see you. You gave me correct descriptions of four relations and friends who had passed away from Earth Life. I was astonished at the time, as I was quite a sceptic in these matters. You also said I should soon leave my residence in B. and go and live in the country, and you described a house. It is strange that that change has actually taken place, and I now live in a country house. I may say further that, although I had the keen desire to live in the country, I saw no possibility of realizing my hope at that time.

On March 7, I called on you again, and, while

discussing occult matters, you said you thought the human mind was in a way like an octopus, and had "feelers" that could suck up information and convey it to the brain. You instantly gave me an illustration of your meaning by giving me a description of furniture in my house, and described the contents of a particular box. You also said my wife's chief thought at the moment was concerning a book-case. This is only too true, for on that subject she is continually talking . . . . In this month's *Review of Reviews* (p. 533) there is an account of a new discovery scientfically made by Dr. Schofield that "hairs or tubes protrude from the nervous system." I don't think it very new, as it is exactly what you demonstrated to me months ago.

On the 27th of May, I again called on you, and you, to my astonishment, told me that I had been greatly upset on the previous Thursday. This was perfectly true, but I had imagined no one else knew it. What I consider is one of the best things you told me is this: On the same day (the 27th) you said I had a big project in view, and that shortly I was going "to meet a handsome aristocrat who lives in a lovely country house"—you could also "see water connected with it." When I arrived home in the evening I found a letter inviting me to meet such a man, and the letter was written by a man whose gardens run down to the sea. You made many other prophecies which, I have not doubt, will in time come true. The one concerning the trip to London to a conference seems likely within three or four weeks.

For the sake of Scientific Research, I do think these facts should be investigated, for, there is no knowing, it may lead up to knowledge that will be of inestimable value to the human race. The knowledge you have already, has been of great assistance to me and to others, and I trust you will long be spared to carry on your investigations. You may always rely on the help and sympathy of

Yours,

A. E. STICKLAND.

The following letter (postcard) contains the confirmation of another prophecy which was made to the above writer, in addition to the acknowledgment of Mr. T. P. Stevens, that four of the prophecies which I made to him have been fulfilled.

When Mr. A. E. Stickland called to see me, towards the end of May, 1907, he expressed surprise that the prophecy regarding "going to live in a country house" had come true. He was quite enthusiastic upon the subjects of his new home and his "settled" condition. I said, "Don't be so sure; you'll be in America before the end of the year." And so he was. I have not a letter of evidence from him, but he told Mr. T. P. Stevens he was going, and said that I had prophesied it.

The postcard from Mr. T. P. Stevens is as follows—

(No. 60.)

Bournemouth,
April 4, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I met Mr. Stickland about the middle of September, 1907, and was telling him of four of your prophecies which had come true in my case, in a most unexpected manner, and he said that he had also had several from you that had been fulfilled, one of them being that he would go to America before the end of 1907; and that he was then arranging to go. And (he) actually left, as you know, before the end of the year.

Yours faithfully,
T. P. STEVENS.

The next letter also refers to the departure of a man who was quite "settled in Bourne-

mouth.'' When I said, ''You'll leave Bournemouth on or near the 20th of next month,'' he laughed, because he was so satisfied with his position, and his employer was very pleased with him. He called on Mrs. Laney to say good-bye, and informed her of his visit to me, and the prophecy which I had made.

(No. 61.)

Boscombe,
Mar. 2, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I feel sure you will be interested to hear your prediction to Mr. N—— on the 15th of January has been fulfilled. Do you remember telling him he would leave B'mouth on or near February 21? As a matter of fact he *left on the 20th ult.* Yet at the time of speaking to you he had no such intention. This is, I think, a clear case of pre-vision.

Sincerely yours,
F. LANEY.

The following letter contains a prophecy, and also confirms the description of a ''spirit Visitant.''

(No. 62.)

Parkstone,
June 28, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

A hasty line to say that your prediction has been literally fulfilled. You may remember that in October last, you described a spirit friend by my side. From the description you gave I recognized a very dear friend—a clergyman of the Church of England—who had ''passed on'' several years previously. You observed that this friend had been seen by you the day before in your drawing-room. Strange to say, it was my intention to have called

upon you the day previous (I think I had promised to do so), but I was prevented from doing so. The day I called I had another engagement but I put it off at the last moment as I felt compelled to call and see you. After you had described my friend, the clergyman with the big theological works, you said that I should recommence my public work and again *take the platform in April*, although I had not the slightest intention of doing (so) at the time. Strange to say, the way opened in a very remarkable manner, and on April 4 I accepted an offer made to me, entered into an engagement and commenced to preach on Sunday, April 21, and have conducted services each Sunday since that date.

Yours truly,
REV. "X. Y. Z."

The following is an extract from another letter—

(No. 63.)

Bournemouth,
May 26, 1908.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

. . . By the way, a prophecy of yours has come true. You said, if you remember, last June that my son would not get employment until November, and strange to say, he did not get a position until November, when he was at last successful in obtaining a situation; when he had the offer of *two*, *one* in London; his wish was to stay here in Bournemouth, for which he feels sorry; he thinks now perhaps it would have been better to have gone from here; one never knows.

With kind regards, etc.

Yours truly,
H—— B——.

The following letter appeared in *Light* on September 3, 1909. I submitted evidence substantiating my statements at the time to the Editor.

Pains of Pre-vision.

Sir,

I notice that in *Light* of August 28 you refer to an article in *The Occult Review* by Mr. Reginald B. Span, on the subject of pre-vision, and say that Mr. Span does not seem grateful for this gift, and you quote his reasons. Perhaps it may be of some interest to your readers to know that, in my case at least, the pre-vision is both sentimentally painful and *physically* painful; that is, if the event foreseen is to be, say, a murder or an accident in which pain will be felt by the victim, for in those cases I actually "get" the pain, be it a blow or a bullet-wound.

Since March last I have enjoyed (?) a run of prophecies. Each Thursday evening I have had pictures presented to me of events about to take place: such as, for instance, the Turkish rising, the Barcelona rebellion, the Spanish reverse at Mount *Gu-ru-go* (only I got the word as *lu-lu-lu*), etc. I have signed testimony from persons present for all of these experiences, but I only submit for your inspection my last two prophecies as they bear more directly on the "pain" question. These two concerned the revolver mystery (vide *Daily Mail*) and the robbery at Mappin and Webb's. In the first case a man was coming downstairs with a revolver in his hand and it went off and *shot him through the head*. My three witnesses say: "Mr. Turvey said he felt as if he were *shot through the head*," and *this* on the Thursday *previous* to the accident. In the next case (Mappin and Webb's robbery) the witnesses, after mentioning that I saw the big robbery, add, "and felt a blow on the head." Your readers will remember that the watchman was "stunned by a blow on the head." This, as the date shows, I felt on the Thursday *previous* to the robbery.

You asked a week or so ago why we foresee only unpleasant things. I believe the reason is that evil, being nearer "matter" than "spirit," is more ponderous in the ether, and is therefore "sensed"

more easily by a Seer. I not only "see" but "feel" the density of evil, and I am pretty sure that wrong-doing has an actual spiritual weight, and thus keeps a spirit "down" and prevents its rising to realms above. The modern investigator says: "How I wish I were clairvoyant"; but the old Seer prayed: "Lord take away my sight." It is nice to be able to give descriptions that cheer the mourners "left behind," but true seership does not stop at that, and it is, as Mr. Span says, "a mercy that God does not open the eyes (to a full extent) of all of us." Those with a mission to perform have *also* a price to pay.

Yours, etc.,
VINCENT N. TURVEY.

The following letter is taken from the "correspondence column" of *Light* for May 21, 1910.

PREDICTIONS OF THE KING'S DEATH.

Weymouth,
May 11, 1910.

SIR,

On April 22 last, while spending the afternoon with a friend at Bournemouth, I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Vincent N. Turvey. After much interesting conversation and while I was telling him a strange story of my losing and recovering a ring, Mr. Turvey interrupted me by saying (*apropos* of nothing, apparently), "The King will die *soon*." I finished my story, but carefully remembered his remark, interjected in so peculiar a manner and with such emphasis.

This may be of interest to some of your readers, and it is doubly so to me, as a fulfilled prophecy occuring in a fortnight to the day.

Yours, etc.,
C.S.B. (COLONEL).

The following letter appeared in *Light* for June 25, 1910. The headline is a little misleading, for the letter concerns *three* prophetic pictures at least, viz. one concerning the Spanish King and a bomb, one concerning an ordinary Channel collision between two vessels, and one concerning a collision between a vessel and a sunken object. The writers refer chiefly to the "two pictures on one plate," hence the headline. For my own part I think that the "ribbon" referred to at the beginning of this chapter, was "viewed" too quickly, hence the two pictures were blurred into one, in the same way that the leaves of a book turned over *very* quickly will make the illustrations blurr into one picture. In closing this chapter, I may say that this phase of Clairvoyance (Prophecy) seems to have stayed with me longer than any other phase. Note how quickly Phone-voyance came and went, in spite of my desire to retain it for scientific test purposes.

TWO PROPHETIC PICTURES.

SIR,

On the Thursday before the body of King Edward was buried we called on Mr. Turvey (knowing that as far back as October he had foretold the death) and asked him if he could see if any King would be murdered during the funeral procession. Mr. Turvey replied, "No, there will be no attempt; but when the Spanish King returns there will be a bomb thrown, but no harm done to the King. But," he added, "I also see a steamboat run into another vessel; but when I look again it seems as if it ran into a derelict or a sunken reef."

Now, sir, as is well known, there was no bomb throwing during the procession, but there was a man looking out for the King of Spain on his return, who threw a bomb and then shot himself. This was followed by a Channel collision, and a steamer ran into a submersible boat, which, to all intents and purposes, may be called a sunken derelict, or sunken rock (*i.e.* an object below water). Mr. Turvey says, as an explanation: "I saw both events clearly, but never dreaming of *two* collisions, I took it as one steamer hitting what at first appeared to be a ship, but on a second look appeared to be a reef. Had a photograph been taken of both events, the striker on each plate would have been practically the same. If the plates were laid on top of each other the object struck would show one way a reef, the other a vessel."

Yours, etc.,

L. PEARCEY.

J. PARADINE.

The two cuttings which follow are extracted from *Light* for July 20 and August 20, 1910, respectively.

MR. TURVEY'S PRE-VISION AND ITS FULFILMENT.

In *Light* of July 9, p. 331, we mentioned the fact that Mr. V. N. Turvey had sent us three sealed envelopes, to be opened when he desired us to do so. We have now received his permission as regards the first of these, and on opening it in the presence of competent witnesses we find that on June 29 he wrote: "Accident at Bournemouth flying week held next month. Airman quite unconscious, and *to look at*, it is death."

Mr. Turvey was present at the Aerodrome on July 12, and saw the accident and the fall of the Hon. Charles Rolls which resulted in his death. He writes:—

On June 27, I saw in the distance (in a violet psychic picture) the Needles, a stretch of water and a part of

the English coast. I do not know Southbourne very well, as I am an invalid and hardly ever go out. I saw a biplane in the air. I saw it collapse. I saw a man stiff and unconscious. I saw death. I *knew* we were to have the airmen here. I therefore concluded the accident was to take place at Bournemouth. I, of course, did not know *who* the airman was, as the pictures do not always (in fact rarely) tell the names of places or persons, any more than do photographs. They *are* "pre-photos." But as I saw the man so clearly I judged him to be a big man *seen at a distance*. It did not occur to me that he might be a little man *seen close to me*, which was the actual fact. I could "sense" the figure was English. Those who know my bad health will admit it was a "miracle" that I was able to go to see the flying; my first visit to a public entertainment for eight years. I went on Tuesday to the Aerodrome. I was close to poor Rolls when he gave himself to save other people. It is not generally known that his biplane failed and dropped part of its tail in a garden *before* he passed over the enclosure in which stood hundreds of people. He tried and succeeded in clearing those people, but it cost the noble fellow his life. Just as he got into the Aerodrome the machine dropped like a stone. The telegraph board showed "pilot unconscious." I saw four spirit forms fly across from the horizon, huge figures. I said "he is dead." Ten minutes passed and then the public were informed by the black flag, half-mast, that a noble, grand-hearted Englishman had died. In my envelope No. 1, Mr. Editor, you will see that I say "unconscious—to look at, it is death." Both statements, alas, are true. I think I shall not register any more prophecies. It is too much like advertising a faculty at the cost of pain to those who mourn, and if I were not pretty sure that the parents would not see *Light* I would tell you to burn the envelope unopened which I sent you on June 29.

Mr. Turvey's Third Prophecy Fulfilled.

In *Light* of July 9, page 331, we mentioned that on June 30, we received from Mr. Vincent N. Turvey three sealed envelopes (the contents of which were unknown to us), that we signed and dated them, and that they would not be opened until Mr. Turvey requested us to disclose their contents. On July 30 (page 359) we gave an account of the opening of envelope number one, and the fulfilment of the prediction which it contained by the fatal fall of the Hon. Charles Rolls at Bournemouth. Envelope number two we have returned to Mr. Turvey, unopened, at his request.

On Tuesday morning last (the 16th) we received a telegram from Mr. Turvey: "Open envelope three; see to-day's *Morning Leader*, floods in Japan."

In envelope number three we found the following prediction:—

Written June 29, 1910, by V. N. Turvey: In near future, say within six weeks, appalling loss of life, possibly running to hundreds. Cause seems a gigantic upheaval of earth and water, such as would be caused by tidal wave, dam bursting, or earth-slide near a river. Place seems to be East. Warm or hot climate, such as China or India.

On turning to *The Morning Leader* we found a telegram from Kobe, dated Monday, as follows:—

The official statement of the casualties consequent upon the floods gives the total number of drowned and missing as 1113. Altogether 125,000 houses were flooded and 200 have been demolished. There is no further danger to Tokio. Over 200,000 persons are receiving relief in Tokio alone.

A *Times* telegram from Tokio, dated August 9, and published on the 10th, states that "unusually

heavy rains have fallen in Japan and have resulted in floods . . Hundreds of houses are under water, and a number of students have been buried in a landslip at Shidzuoka.'' The date given would bring the catastrophe just within six weeks from the date of Mr. Turvey's prophecy.

CHAPTER VII.

FUNCTIONING IN THE "MENTAL BODY."

THIS species of Clairvoyance was at one time called "Spirit-body-travelling"; since, however, the phrase "Mental-body-travelling" has lately come into use among occultists, I shall use the newer form of expression, for I think that it is preferable to the old one.

The editor feels that he must again apologize for the number of times he has made use of the pronouns of the first person in this book, and also for the "Dear Mr. Turvey," etc., of the letters. The pronouns are unavoidable, or almost so; and as the letters are certified copies, their headings *must* appear. Had they been addressed "Dear sir," some very brilliant critic would be sure to say, as one already has done: "This is no evidence—*who* is 'Dear sir'; have you got the envelope?" The editor therefore pleads "guilty," and under the "first offence" act asks for a "light sentence" from the reader.

Since many people begin to read a book at Chapter I., there may be some among my readers who have "skipped the Introduction." It is therefore necessary that they should, for

the better understanding of this chapter, be told that I use the pronoun "I" between inverted commas to denote that part of my consciousness which appears to leave the physical body, and to assume a distinct body of its own, which body is capable of functioning by means of five or more senses. I use the word "Me," in capital letters and between inverted commas, to denote the body which is left at home, and is apparently quite normal but for the fact that it can receive messages from "I" by means of clairaudience.

The editor considers that a certain amount of explanation is required concerning the phases of phenomena which are mentioned in this chapter. As he is restricted by the amount of space at his disposal, the observations which are expressed are written in a somewhat more precisely positive manner than would otherwise have been adopted.

In using the word "visible" the editor does not wish to be understood as meaning *objectively* visible, for that would, of course, imply the presence of a "materialized form"; and although, perhaps, it would be possible for "I" to "materialize" under proper conditions, nevertheless, "I" has not yet attempted to do so.

I must also remark that, wherever it has been stated that "I saw a spirit," it has been taken for granted that the reader would understand that the "spirit" was not objectively visible, as is a chair, a table, or a ghost; but

that the "spirit form" was seen with the *inner* vision.

There is no need for me to discuss the many bodies that belong to man, for this little book is only concerned with two of these in addition to the physical body. In order to be concise, the editor proposes to deal first with a "body" which he has actually used, which is not the "I" which he calls the "mental body." Some people use the word "astral body" as applicable to the two cases that follow; and although the editor considers the word "astral" to be objectionable, for this "body" is not a starry body yet he adopts it because the term is in pretty general use among Western occultists.

The "astral" body, which is referred to in the letters numbered 64 and 66, went of its own accord when "Me" was asleep. "Me" knew nothing of the visitation, and it appears that it (the "astral" body) did not function in any way. For my own part, I think that this body is an inferior body altogether to the mental body.

Although the writer of letter No. 64 was not a clairvoyant, she was "passive" at the time of the visitation; and since the body referred to is slightly more solid, so to speak, than the "I" (mental body), it is much easier to "see" it. The mental body is rarely seen, even by clairvoyants; but I publish one letter, No. 65, in which the reader will see that "I" was visible.

The astral body referred to in letters Nos. 64 and 66 must not be confused with the "double," which is an *objectively* visible body, such as was that which was used by Sir Carne Rasch on the occasion when he was seen in the House of Commons at the time when his physical body was lying ill in bed.

Briefly, then, we may say that all the documents and letters in this chapter concern the mental body ("I"), which *functions*, but is rarely *visible*; and letters Nos. 64 and 66 concern a non-functioning etheric body which is, unlike the "I", *not* projected where and when I like, but which wanders off on its own account unknown to "Me."

The astral body appears to be blue-grey in colour, and the mental body pale yellow.

(No. 64.)

London,
Oct. 10, 1906.

DEAR SIR,

I am quite willing to testify to the fact that I have seen "you" when your body was hundreds of miles away from me. I am not a clairvoyant, and was not asleep at the time.

I distinctly saw you three-quarter-length in a sort of halo (vignette?), floating in the air above my wash-stand between window and wardrobe. I called out in fear and you immediately vanished.

Yours truly,
M. D. NEWTON.

(No. 66.)

Bournemouth,
June 9, 1908.

DEAR TURVEY,

Knowing that you are interested in all things

psychic, I thought you would be able to explain the following experience which I had some time since.

Some few nights ago, following my usual custom after supper, I went into my office to write some letters, etc. Here let me explain, my writing-table is immediately in front of a large window facing the street, there is a small lawn some twelve feet across, between the window and pavement, immediately in front of the window on the edge of the pavement stands an ordinary street lamp, the light of which penetrates into my office. My window is covered half-way up by paper to represent stained glass; the room is well lit by three electric lights suspended from the centre of the ceiling. As I sit at my desk, the door is in the left-hand corner of the wall at my back. I mention all this so as to do away with all possible suggestion of shadows. Now as near as I can judge it must have been between eleven-thirty and twelve o'clock (I had some time since watched the man extinguish the street lamp, which he usually does at about eleven o'clock). While writing I became conscious of some one being present, and turned round expecting to find my wife (who beside myself was the only one not yet retired for the night) standing in the doorway of my room. You can imagine my surprise to see a shadowy ethereal form, which I was able to recognize as yourself. I waited for some sign or impression, but got neither; but watched the form disappear, as it seemed to me, in the darkness of the hall. I went to my wife, who I found sewing in another part of the house and told her what I had seen. We both agreed to say nothing about it, but wait to hear if you had consciously endeavoured to make your presence known to me on that particular evening, or rather night. As we have not heard from you, I thought it would prove of interest to you.

Yours sincerely,

F. T. BLAKE.

All the letters and "documents" which

follow concern the "I," or mental body, therefore the reader can now dismiss the astral body from his or her mind so far as this book is concerned.

Letter No. 65 vouches for the visibility of "I" at a séance at which "I" had functioned (*i.e.* had used a table to spell out "I's" name, etc.) Letter No. 67 is a strange and rare case of "I's" ability *to smell.* It is printed in order to show that the senses of "I" equal those of the physical body in number, although, perhaps they are not always able to operate simultaneously. Thus "I" can at times see and smell, but not hear nor touch; at other times "I" can talk, and move a table, but not "see" very clearly.

This is, I believe, largely a question of practice; but many sitters object to a "control" who is still in the body. "It ain't spirits!" The sitters and mediums mentioned in this book are larger-minded people, and kindly permitted "I" to experiment.

(No. 65.)

Bournemouth,
June 14, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Last night I was at a séance held at least two miles from your house, and although your body was *not* in the room I saw distinctly what, for want of better words, I must call "you in the spirit body." I felt it was so *real* that I must get up and place a chair for you.

Yours very sincerely,
H—— B——.

(No. 67.)

Bournemouth,
June 15, 1907.

DEAR SIR,

We called on you on the 7th inst. You were then a stranger to us. You have not been in our house: during our conversation you said your spirit would go to our house. You correctly described position of rooms and contents of Mrs. C——'s room and part of contents of other rooms, and you said quite correctly, "There is a gas escape here—'I' smell it."

Yours truly,
N—— H——.
A—— C——.

The writer of the following letter is only vouching for the physical facts of the case; but as I have given him and his mother so many "tests," he has accepted the statement, " 'I' came in at the window."

(No. 68.)

Bournemouth,
June 10, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

I have great pleasure in testifying to the correct description you gave me at your house last Tuesday evening, 4th June, 1907, viz:—

That very late, about eight days and nights previous, you in spirit came in through my window and saw me sitting on the edge of my bed, partly undressed (trousers and vest), pillow end, facing the window, thinking deeply. You also gave me a true description of size of the bed (four feet long; brass knobs), furniture, etc., of which I give a plan.

You also gave me the description of a spirit form of a small old lady who came into the room whilst I was in the position described, whom you thought had passed on some *seven*teen or twenty-*seven* years

ago. This spirit really passed on *seven* years ago and was a great-aunt of mine who was over eighty years of age. This really occurred, and my belief is that this aunt in spirit form just then brought my mother, who is alive, to my door when I was in the midst of great despondency.

Sincerely yours,
S—— B——.

The following letter presents a difficulty to those who would explain these phenomena by Telepathy. It is a case in which "I" obtained eight or nine descriptive points concerning a man's house, but failed to obtain correct replies to questions concerning things about which he *was* thinking.

Briefly the story is as follows:—

A sceptic called to see me, and I told him of the faculty which at times I possessed. He asked me to let "I" go to Ireland, and bring back a description of his house. "I" went, and obtained about nine points correctly.

After "I" had returned he asked me further questions, such as, "What was the wall-paper like?" "Did you see a strange thing in the corner of the sitting-room?" I replied, "No, 'I' only saw what I have told you." Clearly he must have been thinking of the fact that there was no wall-paper at all, for, otherwise, he would not have tried to catch me tripping by referring to it. Also, he must have been thinking of the "strange object" (an old spinning wheel, I believe), or else he could not have referred to it.

Hence we see that "I" saw that which was

not necessarily in his mind, but failed to "see" what certainly *was* in his mind.

(No. 70.)

Ireland.

DEAR TURVEY,

You certainly told me eight or nine points correctly of my house, and I am quite sure you have never seen it or a photo of it. These items of information you gave me voluntarily, but when afterwards I put two definite questions to you, your replies were wrong.

A— S— H——.

The following extract is only part of the letter; the other part will be found in Chapter I., letter No. 5A. A certain amount of explanation is needed in order that the reader may be able to draw his conclusions.

Mr. Percy Street had given me permission to visit his house in the mental body whenever I felt that "I" could do so.

In passing I should like to remark that I make it a fixed rule never to intrude without permission, and, of course, only to "see" that which I should be allowed to see in the ordinary way.

I accepted the invitation, and his letter shows that on four occasion "I" managed to see something.

The last paragraph (5) of his letter refers to something which is a unique experience to me; and, therefore, I will endeavour to lay it before the reader as fully as is possible.

On the Tuesday to which Mr. Street refers, he, Mr. Walker, and one or two other friends

had spent the evening with me. They left my house at about 10.30 p.m. Directly they had gone I hurried into bed and endeavoured to follow them in the mental body, in order, if possible, to obtain an unexpected "test" which would enable us all to reply in the negative to the question, "Was anything of this in your mind at the time?" My intention was to notice one or two things which I could not know in the ordinary way, such as the positions in which they sat, the appearance of the conductor, etc., and to tell them about it when they next visited me. The idea of "controlling" Mr. Walker was *not* in "Me's" brain, and must, I think, be attributed to an afterthought on the part of "I." In noticing the conductor "I" had an experience which I do not desire to have repeated. The conductor stood in such a position that had "I" been a physical body "I" could not have passed by him without asking him to step aside. As he did not, of course, see "I," "I" was compelled to walk through half of him, and, at the same time, half of the door post. But the most extraordinary thing about this was the fact that although dead matter, such as a brick wall, does not affect either "I" or "Me" when "I" pass through it, yet in walking through the *man* "Me," in bed at home, felt dreadfully sick, and as if my *physical* body had been passed through another body.

When "I" got inside the tram "I" tried to make Mr. Walker feel "I's" presence by

partly "controlling" him. He felt the "control," but naturally shook it off as he was in a tram. Mr. Walker has since told me that he felt the "control" sufficiently long to know that it was not one of his own "guides" ; but that it was a stranger to him (as a control), who "felt quite raspy" compared to the easy or smooth way in which his guides take control of him. On the following Tuesday, Mr. Walker admitted that some one had tried to take "control" of him, and this, too, at the *exact* spot where I told them "I" had boarded their tramcar.

(No. 5B.)

Bournemouth,
Jan. 9, 1906.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

As regards your "spirit" leaving your body, of course I cannot say; but certainly you have told me so, and have told me what you saw. What you have told me as having been seen by your "spirit" is true; that is to say—

1. My wife was slightly "put out" at 11.30 on the day you said so.

2. I *was* ruling lines with a grey background on the day and at the time you mentioned.

3. Our bedroom is furnished as you say you saw it, there was something red on the bed, and I was near the door.

4. Also I did on another day, as you say, "run downstairs in a hurry and rather cross."

5. And last Tuesday we five did sit in a tram as you say you saw us, the conductor does answer the description and I did see Mr. Walker shake off an influence, but whether it was from your spirit I cannot say.

This makes five distinct "spirit" visits, if they are such.

Yours truly,
P. R. STREET.

The editor calls the following papers "documents" in order to distinguish between those *letters* which are signed by only one (or two) persons and those papers which are signed by several people.

The reader will, perhaps, pardon a certain amount of explanation, for without it the documents could not be understood except by such as are conversant with all phases of occult phenomena. There are two classes of those who know all about it—the critics, who have not investigated the phenomena at all, and the enthusiastic "five-minute-old converts." The worthy members of both these classes either know *all* that is possible, or else they know *how* everything which occurs is done. Few of us ever know enough to know that we *don't*, but merely *think* that we, know.

First of all, then, let me frankly admit that the documents which follow would not be considered to be good evidence by a "trained observer," a professional "exposer," or by the "sceptic" who is so badly deluded that he considers his disbelief can *disprove* facts. The documents are not so satisfactory as are the letters which have been laid before the reader, because the former were written in great haste, at a time when it was *highly* improbable that I should ever inflict myself, in print, upon the

public. They are little more than rough notes jotted down and signed, in order that there should be some sort of evidence available in case I got sufficiently well to write my experiences. It was my intention, at first, to omit these documents altogether; for I could see in my mind's eye how easily Mr. Carrington, for instance, could rend them all to shreds, and prove, well! let us say, that white is black. His criticism would make out that I am a strong, healthy, wealthy, fradulent impostor, able to walk miles in order to ferret out people's secrets, employ hundreds of detectives for the same object, engage a staff of men to travel all over the world *reading the inscriptions on tombstones* (see his book, "Psychic Phenomena"), instal a Marconi system in my house, and, in fact, do and be *everything* and *anything* but an invalid with a sense of honour, who has the misfortune to be, perhaps, a forerunner of a future race, or a "re-incarnated" (?) member of a past one.

However, as I do not wish to see facts hidden away and lost for the lack of a little moral courage on my own part, I submit what little evidence I can, and remain content with the *hope* that the documents will appeal to a *few* people, and that they will therefore make this book more acceptable than it would have been had my statements been left *entirely* unsubstantiated.

First of all, the reader must be informed as to how it happened that these documents came

to be written, and also—a weak (?) spot on which a critic is sure to lay his *foot* (his finger would not be big enough)—as to how it is that the witnesses are able to vouch for what "I" or "Me" did.

A few friends who were interested in psychic phenomena used to call upon me on Tuesday evenings (1905-1906). On Friday evenings they met at Mr. Walker's house, and held séances for psychic phenomena. Knowing that "I" frequently left "Me," I asked them if they would allow "I" to visit them during their séance, in order to prove that such a phenomenon was actually possible. They kindly consented, and here I tender my thanks to them. When they called upon me on the Tuesday, they asked me if "I" had tried to go to their séance on the previous Friday. Thereupon I told them whether "I" had gone or not, and stated what "I" had seen and what "I" had tried to do. A "document" was then drawn up and signed. The reader will notice that I was always made to tell my story *first*. Thus, in giving the account of what "I" had tried to do at their séance, on one occasion I said, " 'I' tried to go to your séance, and when 'I' got there 'I' saw you like a lot of *dolls* in a blue mist; and then 'I' tried to make passes about a foot away from Mr. Gartside, and to make him brush his hair with his hand and shake his head." The reader will not that "I," evidently misjudging the distance, actually *touched* Mr. Gartside, and that he *felt* the touch.

There was *no* arrangement as to *when* I should go, beyond the general invitation, "Whenever you feel well enough to try." And it is worth recording that *never once* was "I" announced by a medium as being present when I had not made an attempt to be present, and never once did a medium fail to do *something* that to some extent tallied with my version when "I" did go. This rather upsets "suggestion by anticipation" as an explanation.

As there may be some among my readers who do not know the meaning of the word "control," I shall endeavour to explain it so far as is necessary.

Until quite recently, in spiritualist circles, "control" had only two meanings; but, unfortunately, certain investigators, with that love of coining new words which is far too prevalent, have given to the word "control" a third meaning.

When a medium is entranced some investigators hold his or her arms and legs, in order to prevent those useful parts of the anatomy from moving a table or touching some one's face under the pretence of "spirit" action. This these investigators call "controlling the medium's hands"; because, I presume "*holding*" would be too much like the phraseology of laymen. Now, as a "spirit" often "controls" a person's hand in order to make him write automatically (Mr. Stead's for instance), we see how liable one is to be confused by the weird machinations of the "word-coiner."

In using the word "control," the editor does so in the "old-style manner." That is to say, if a "spirit" hypnotizes a medium and makes use of the medium's body in order to talk, see, hear, etc., then the medium is said to be "controlled by a spirit." If the "spirit" is one who often uses that medium, then the "spirit" is called the medium's "guide," or, sometimes, the medium's (regular) "control." This is well understood by most spiritualists; hence my objection to the phrase "controlling the medium" when "*holding* the medium" would save confusion. Because I maintain that "I" is to all intents and purposes a "spirit" when "I" has left "Me", the reader will understand that the sentence "Mr. X.Y.Z. was controlled by Mr. Turvey" means "Mr Turvey's mental body, acting as does a 'spirit guide,' used Mr. X.Y.Z.'s organism (by permission) in order to demonstrate that Mr. Turvey was (mentally) in the room, etc." In the light of this explanation document No. 5 will now be clear to those who might otherwise wonder how I could introduce myself to a lady when I *was not there* (in the ordinary way).

So far as I know, there is no account ***written directly*** by a "spirit guide" of the method of taking control of a medium; and, since opinions differ, even among old spiritualists, I shall take the liberty of breaking the rule (of admitting facts and descriptions of sensations only) which I made for myself when planning this book, seeing that a brief outline

of "I's" method of "taking control" may be of interest to some of my readers.

First of all, then, "Me" must be comfortably settled—in bed, on a couch, or in a chair—fully conscious, perhaps smoking a cigarette. *PROVIDED THE FACULTY BE ACTIVE* (big italics, Mr. Printer, please, or else some cute critic will say that I claim to use the mental body *whenever* I like), I say (mentally) "I" am going to Boscombe, and shall try to "control" Mr. X.Y.Z. "I" leaves "Me," and comes to consciousness about a quarter of a mile away from my house. In a second or two "I" tells "Me" that "I" has arrived, and that Mr. X.Y.Z. feels "I's" presence. "Me" thinks, "Try to make him say 'Hullo! Mr. Jones; how are you?' " "I" replies, "That's done." Then "Me" says, "Make him do so and so." Perhaps "I" cannot do that particular thing, and "I" therefore does something else on its own hook, so to speak, and tells "Me" what "I" tried to make Mr. Jones do, after "I" has returned to "Me."

In moving a table "I" tilts out the letters ABC, etc., one tilt of the table being A, and three or four tilts C or D, etc. In order that this should be done, "Me" taps his foot on the floor, or his left hand on a cushion, and "I" *tilts* the table in response to the *taps* made by "Me."

The difficulties (and perhaps, dangers) are many. First, "I" has to make the medium's

own ideas "lie down quiet"; for, *absurd* as it may appear to say so, these "ideas" *seem* to stand up from the brain like blades of grass on red jelly, and until "I" can get one or two of these "blades" to "lie flat," "I" cannot get "Me's" message delivered even to a small extent. Then, again, other "influences" try to "chip into the conversation" and to "play the idiot" with the cords of communication between "I" and "Me," and between "I" and the medium. Furthermore, "I" *cannot always remember* what "Me" wanted to make the medium say or do. Sometimes, on the other hand, "I" does a lot more than "Me" knows.

But worst of all, and this it was which chiefly caused me to drop the experiments, when once "I" had "laid a communication wire" to any brain, other impersonating entities, who could not lay one for themselves, might make use of it, and by giving silly messages get the unfortunate Mr. Turvey into trouble.

There is one extraordinary feature of this phenomenon, viz., at times "I's" faculties *transcend* those of "Me," and at other times they are much inferior. Thus "I" has diagnosed an illness, whereas (normally) I could not have done so; and "I" has failed to see a *huge bookcase* in a certain room, whereas, of course, any one in the body could have seen it with half an eye!

The above remarks may possibly help to explain the reason why "spirits" can, or cannot, do or remember this or that. For my

own part, I think nothing is impossible to the mind of man under appropriate circumstances, and yet very little can be done without certain conditions being satisfied.

Documents No. 1 and No. 2 practically speak for themselves, and therefore I shall spare the reader any further infliction from my pen.

(*Document No.* 1.)

We, the undersigned, declare the following statements to be true in so far as we are jointly and severally concerned.

On Friday, February 9, 1906, a "sitting" was held at Mr. Walker's house, four miles from Mr. Turvey's. Present (five persons).

Mr. Turvey was sitting at home and willed to attend the séance in "Spirit body." "He came and saw us all as small dolls in a blue mist. He tried to attract Mr. Gartside's attention. Mr. Gartside felt Mr. Turvey's presence and said so, made room for him (He drew up on his chair.—V.N.T.), and then felt him touch him and said so. Mr. Turvey tried to make "passes" a *foot* away from Mr. Gartside and make him brush his hair up with his hands and shake his head.

J. WALKER.
M. WALKER.
N. GARTSIDE.

We, the undersigned, vouch for correctness of the foregoing statements.

W. STREET.
A— R——.

(*Document No.* 2.)

Bournemouth,
Mar. 6, 1906.

We, the undersigned, bear witness to the truth of

the following incident in so far as we are jointly and severally concerned. At a sitting held four miles from Mr. Turvey's house. Present (five persons). On February 16, 1906, Mr. Gartside said: "Mr. Turvey is not here" (in the spirit body), and on the Tuesday following, Mr. Turvey, in reply to questions, said: "'I' did not try to go, I was too ill." On the Friday following (February 23) Mr. Turvey was in bed, at nine, in his house—the usual sitting was held four miles away. Mr. Gartside said: "Mr. Turvey is here," and began to cough, and felt a pain in his left lung,* and Mr. Walker said: "That is not your usual cough." "No" he replied, "it is Mr. Turvey's." Then Mr. Gartside stood up for a moment or two. On Mr. Turvey's being questioned on the following Tuesday: "Did 'you' come?" He said: "Yes, 'I' came and then ('Me') began to cough so 'I' returned to my body. Then 'I' went again and tried to make Mr. Gartside stand up and walk round the circle. But I was too ill to 'see' if he did it. Did he feel me there? What happened?"

We, the undersigned, in so far as the actions of Mr. Gartside are described in the foregoing, testify as to the correctness of the statement.

W. J. STREET.
J. WALKER.
M. WALKER.
A— W— R——.

*(My pain is in the left lung—V. N. Turvey.)

The following document (No. 3) needs but few remarks from me. The date shows it to be my first attempt at "control" after a year's rest. It took place at a different house, and I do not know who was the medium that "I" used; certainly it was not the Mr. Gartside of documents Nos. 1 and 2, nor the Mr. Blake of the next series. Probably "I" moved the

table directly with energy drawn from my own body and from the sitters' bodies. Be this as it may, no one at any of the three séances (the reader will note that the document concerns *three* separate séances) was conscious of being used by "I."

(*Document No.* 3.)

We, the undersigned, testify to the following facts, some of us for one, two, or all of the dates given.

We attended a séance at a house at least two miles from Mr. Turvey's home on April 4, 11, and 18, 1907, and the table spelt out, on the first occasion, "T U R V"; on the next, "VINCENT NEWTON TURVEY," the middle name being evidently unknown to any one, judging by the general remarks. And on the last occasion the table spelt "TURVEY," and answered correctly one or two test questions.

Mr. Turvey was not in the room in visible form.

J. WALKER. H. MUNDAY.
C. LUCKHAM. F. HARTLEY.
V. HARTLEY. H— G—— (REV.)
C. HARTLEY.

The next documents are in reference to my last experiments. That the results are not of much importance is due merely to lack of practice, development, time, and to the small number of attempts made, etc., etc.; but that *something* in my mind has been spoken or done by a man four miles away, at the time I wanted him to act or speak, and to the person *to whom* I wished to speak, is, I consider, a fact of importance, for it tends to disprove the commonly accepted opinion that man cannot function apart from his *organism*.

Since the documents are not very explana-

tory, I propose to give my version of what happened, and to refer the reader to the documents as proofs that will substantiate a part of what I say.

Document No. 4 is easily explained. Messrs. J. Walker and G. Luckham were "sitters" *pro tem.* at the "circle" where the table spelt "T U R V. " It appears that Mr. Luckham was doubtful if it *were* "I" who moved the table. So, without informing any one of my intention, "I" tried to go to their *own* circle and then to control *Mr. Walker*, whom I had a year before "influenced" in a tram (see letter No. 5B), and make him say, "Well, Luckham, I have done it now." Instead of this taking place, Mr. Blake, quite a new personage for my experiments, went under the "control" of "I," and said "Well, *Walker*, I have done it now." All I can say about this is, that probably "I" knowing *more* than "Me," found Mr. Blake a better medium for "I's" purpose *at the time*, and therefore used him instead of Mr. Walker.

(*Document No.* 4.)

We, the undersigned, testify to the following facts, which occurred at above address on June 19, 1907—

Mr. Blake was apparently "controlled" by an influence purporting to be "V. N. Turvey." He was at first made to write Mr. Turvey's name, and then, assuming Mr. Turvey's mannerism, he shook hands with Mr. Walker, and said, "Well, Walker, I have done it."

So convinced were we that Mr. Blake *was* controlled by Mr. Turvey, that we signed a similar letter to this,

and gave it to him; but we therein stated, "Mr Blake was controlled by Mr. Turvey." And it is at Mr. Turvey's *own* request that we protect ourselves from criticism by adding the words "apparently" and "by an influence purporting to be." Mr. Turvey was not in the room in his body. We believe his statement that he was in his house four miles away.

Signed by M. WALKER.
J. WALKER.
E. BLAKE (Mrs.)
G. LUCKHAM.
F. LANEY.

I may say that my signature as written by Mr. Blake was nearly as good as that which I write when I am very ill; and therefore I think that with practice we could get it exactly.

The next attempt was partly a failure; for, although "I" controlled Mr. Blake and gave messages through him, yet "I" could not get him to give two particular "test" sentences. The tests I wanted to make Mr. Blake give to the circle were, first, to chaff Mrs. Walker for not having been to see me for such a long time, and secondly, to introduce myself (through the medium) to Mrs. Laney (a lady of whom I had heard, but whom I had not seen). I had mentioned *both* these proposed tests to Mr. Walker previously to attempting them; but, as I said before, "I" failed to make the medium give them. But at the next séance "I" was more successful, both messages being given correctly; and my personality and mannerisms were strikingly assumed by the medium. As Mr. Walker only remembers my telling him of my desire to chaff Mrs. Walker, he only signs for

one "test." In my opinion the test is all the more satisfactory because of the fact that Mr. Walker was *not* in the séance room at the time it was *accomplished*, although he had been in the room at the previous séance, when "I" had *failed*. This fact ought to do away with the theory of "suggestion of one of the sitters" as an explanation.

There is another peculiar thing about this incident, and I append a letter of testimony in order to substantiate my statement. When "I" controlled Mr. Blake, and made him shake hands with Mrs. Laney, "I" particularly noticed the sort of dress she was wearing at the time, and when, a few days later, I (in the body) was introduced to her, I correctly described to her the dress which she wore when at the séance. I had never seen her in my life; no one had told me what she wore, and I did not mention it to any one until I actually met her; and *then* she was wearing a different dress to the one that "I" saw at the séance.

(No. 69.)

Bournemouth,
July 19, 1907.

DEAR MR. TURVEY,

Referring to our conversation on the 17th inst. You mentioned to me that when I was at the "sitting" held July 3, 1907, I was "wearing something green at the top part of my dress, you had seen it, and also that I sat 'low' at the table, causing me to appear a much shorter woman than I am."

Now these two statements are singularly correct. You claim that your "spirit" actually controls the

medium, using hypnotism and Telepathy as "spirits" do. You further claim that your spirit is actually *there*, and certainly the two facts you gave me seem to prove your claims. I fail to see how you could so correctly describe my dress if the phenomena was only "hypnotism and Telepathy at a distance," for in that case the hypnotized medium would have to hypnotize you, his hypnotizer, which I should think is impossible, in order to telepath back to you, "Mrs. Laney wears green cross-over, etc." These details are of great interest to me, for in conjunction with others (as instance the difficult breathing of the medium) it proves the possibility of an incarnate spirit effecting control of a medium.

Sincerely yours,
F. LANEY.

The *Document No.* 5 is as follows:—

July 4, 1907.

At the circle held at C—— Rd., Bournemouth, Mr. Blake, under control of Mr. Turvey, turned to Mrs. Laney and introduced himself, at same time shaking hands, and then turning to Mrs. Walker he inquired why she had not come to see him.

The second message was particularly convincing in this respect; unknown to the rest of the sitters, Mr. Turvey had made the same remark to Mr. Walker in his (Mr. T's) garden about two hours previous, and there could not be any chance of thought-reading in this particular case, as Mr. Walker had to retire from the circle soon after it opened, and had not mentioned this remark of Mr. Turvey's to any one.

F. LANEY.
M. WALKER, (Mrs.)
G. LUCKHAM.
J. WALKER.
MRS. E. BLAKE.

The next document (No. 6) is a very strange

one, and therefore requires a few editorial remarks.

On Sunday evening, July 7, 1907, whilst I was resting on a sofa, I became aware of the fact that "I" was ready to leave "Me." I thought that "I" might go to the Bournemouth Spiritualists' (public) Hall, and there try to control Mr. Blake. "Me" did not receive any message from "I," but appeared to see only *one person* (a woman) in the Hall, with a "spirit form" standing behind her. "Me" did not see Mr. Blake, and, therefore, although "Me" *felt* that "I" had controlled him, yet "Me" did not *know*, until "I" came back, exactly what had happened. Then this happened—which, I admit, seems to be absurd, and therefore I print it because its very absurdity *should* exonerate me from the charge of "story-telling." "I" came back to "Me" and said, " 'I' made Blake give a clairvoyant description to a lady of her deceased husband. *The "spirit" whom you* (my body) *also saw.*'

I asked myself, "How on earth did 'I' know that 'Me' saw it?" and "What part of 'Me' was *clairvoyant*, seeing that the clairvoyant 'I' was away?" and, "If 'Me' saw the 'spirit' and the woman, why did not 'Me' know that 'I' *saw through* Mr. Blake's eyes, and not through my own optics, as 'Me' 'felt' it did?" The time at which I said "I" had gone was checked, and it tallied with the time at which description was given.

Those who sign the document are sure it

was "I" who controlled, and Mr. Blake was so obviously "I" that one or two of the audience, who did *not* know of our experiments, said, "Why, Mr. Blake is controlled by Mr. Turvey. It is exactly Mr. Turvey's manner" (when giving clairvoyance in public), etc., etc.

Another strange thing about this description is the fact that Mr. Blake was not a clairvoyant at the time, although he has since then developed Clairvoyance and trance speaking.

As the document refers to two events I must now explain the second one.

On the Wednesday following the 7th of July, 1907, I retired into my drawing-room with the intention of trying to go to a séance at Pokesdown (some four miles distant) in the mental body.

"Me" had hardly got settled on the sofa before "I" was free and away from the house. "I" had just taken control of the medium when "Me" was disturbed by some loud talking in my hall, and "I" returned in haste to the body. Now for the sequel. I went out of the room into the hall to see why I had been disturbed. There was my wife, a maid, the cook, a nurse, and a *Persian cat*. This cat had followed the maid home, and the noise was about, "Oh, *do* let us keep it," etc., etc. A number of excited persons talking about a *cat*. And exactly at the time that the noise commenced in my hall, the medium, four miles away, shouted out, "Cat, cat, cat!"

The document is as follows: –

(*Document No.* 6.)

July 10, 1907.

At the "after-circle" in Hall on Sunday night, 7th inst., Mr. Blake, under control of Mr. Turvey, described to a lady in Hall the form of a gentleman, whom she recognized.

At the usual weekly circle held in Pokesdown Mr. Blake, under control, said in a very emphatic manner "Cat." This was all, as the "control" then left.

J. WALKER.
E. BLAKE (Mrs.)
G. LUCKHAM.
M. WALKER.

The two letters which follow appeared in *Light* on July 24, 1908, and on August 28, 1908, respectively, and what little evidence it was possible to obtain was submitted to the editor; as, however, this must obviously have been meagre in amount, the letters are submitted for the use of the student rather than for that of the scientific investigator or the "sceptic."

They bear out a statement which I have frequently made, viz., when a phenomenon occurs which is new to me, I generally experience another which seems to confirm the theory which I had set forth as a possible solution of the first. The reader will notice that these two letters may possibly solve the difficulties mentioned in the paragraphs, concerning "Me" being clairvoyant, while "I" was giving a description in public through the organism of Mr. Blake.

It is remarkable, too, that much which I

gather from my *own* experiences, and keep to myself as mere opinions or tentative thoughts, I often find in other writers' works that fall into my hands later on; and when, emboldened by example, I *dare* to offer a theory, I am generally accused of plagiarizing from those who have produced no facts at all.

I *may* propose an explanation *after* I have had an experience, but I *never* form a theory *first*, for fear of self-suggestion. That is a *great* danger of which few people are aware.

At one time I attributed all "spirits" to anything else but the dead; but, after some had spoken to me in various languages of which I know *nothing*, and the "*gibberish*" (as I thought it to be), when translated, had turned out to be, Hindu, Persian, Arabic, Sikh (about ten languages in all), *then* I said, "Here is something which I cannot attribute to hallucination." If they are *not* "spirits," then — WHAT ON EARTH ARE THEY?

In closing, I would most *emphatically* say that I do *not* claim to be able to produce phenomena at will; at times I can do nothing at all. The various occurrences herein recorded "came of their own accord," so to speak, and I have noticed that after each of my many illnesses I experience another and quite *unexpected* form of super-normal mental activity, or, as I prefer to call it, a new phase of Seership.

"I," "ME," AND "IT."

SIR,

The above headline is not self-explanatory; but

because of its peculiarity it may attract the attention of some one who can tell me if it be a correct solution for the following strange experience.

In my private correspondence (psychic) I use "I" in inverted commas to denote a part of my consciousness that appears to become detached at times and to be able to function at a distance from the body. I use "Me" with a capital "M" and in inverted commas to denote the body which remains at home and is to all intents and purposes perfectly normal. Possibly some of your readers may have had similar experiences, and will let me know how far they tally with mine, and whether their conclusion agrees with mine, *i.e.* that " 'I,' 'Me,' and 'It' " is the nearest solution.

One afternoon a few weeks ago I went to sleep on the sofa; after a time, probably about forty minutes, I became aware that there was an indistinct conversation going on somewhere very near me. Knowing that all my people were out and that my house stands detached in its own grounds, I wondered what it meant. Then I realized that I was asleep and was "hearing" clair-audiently, and that those who were conversing were not "spirits," but some one inside me, and some one outside of me, and yet part of me, because both voices were "Turvey" in language, etc. I caught no sentence, save here and there a word or two such as "understand—no condition—not yet," etc. Then I heard the sentence, "But you had better wake *it* up now, as there is a man coming to the house in a minute." I woke and had just enough time to throw off my rug and smooth my hair with my hand, when the front door bell rang. As I did not expect a visitor, it was not a fixed thought that woke me, as is a common experience with every one. I do not intend to offer any theory, and will only say that the nearest simile I can give to describe my feelings is this: Let us suppose that a shop can hear people talking; that the shop is in charge of a manager, and that the owner never or rarely visits the shop.

Well! I felt as if the brain was the shop, which overheard the manager receiving private orders from the owner, who had unexpectedly called on him. For the present I hold the theory that it was the *Ego* talking to the *sub-conscious mind* about the future work that the *brain* had to do. The Ego was "boss" in every sense of the word—hence my headline, "'I,' 'Me,' and 'It'."

I am only *sure* of four things: that "wake it up" meant wake up my body; that one voice appeared to be inside the body (about the solar plexus); that the voices were not the voices of people in or near the house; and that I did not expect a visitor. I am fairly certain that the commanding voice (owner of the shop) was not a separate entity, and I am pretty sure that I was not dreaming. I may say that my sensations were, of course, realized after I was awakened.

Yours, etc.

VINCENT N. TURVEY.

A THREEFOLD CONSCIOUSNESS.

SIR,—

The general explanation of normal Clairvoyance is that the spirit of man is "seeing," while at the same time the physical body is normal; or, as Hudson would say, "The conscious and subconscious minds both work at the same time." Sometimes, in Spirit-body-travelling, clairvoyants declare: "I saw my own physical body lying on the bed," etc., but I have not yet heard of the physical body also seeing the spirit-body, for, to do that, it would have to see objectively and normally. The common idea, then, that the spirit-body "sees" at the same time that the physical body sees, could not apply if the spirit-body had left the physical, hence the physical does not see the spirit going away. I am aware all this is open to question, but I mention it in order to explain a recent experience in which my body, soul and spirit (or my bodies physical, astral and mental—call them

what you will), all functioned at once. To prevent wrangling over words, I will call these bodies A, B, and C, of which A is the organism that is apparently normal, and which, when met in the street, is called by my name.

On July 15 last three gentlemen called to see me, and while we were conversing on occultism three questions were put to me. As I could not answer them, and as none of my "Teachers" were present, I said that I would try to go to India in either body B or C, and ask a "Brother" there to answer the questions. I expected to go as usual in the mental body, B, leaving the physical body, A, in the care of C, but something different took place. From the back of the neck of A a large crystal ball (C) shot out and flew over to India, fell at the feet of my Hindu brother, asked the questions, telepathed the answers back through B to A, which repeated them to my visitors, and then C came back. Whilst C was coming back A got the message, "Hullo! I am just about half-way between Russia and Italy and there's an earthquake just going to take place." As a matter of fact the earthquake took place in *Greece* about ten hours later. Now the prophecy is strange enough—so is the crystal ball—but the strangest thing of all is that I was conscious in A, conscious in B, and conscious in C, because A was smoking and talking, B was watching C on its travels and receiving impressions, and C was talking to the Hindu.

The "sensing" of the coming of the earthquake was a fact which puts this experience beyond "mere hallucination."

All my visitors, whose names I enclose, testify to the prophecy. Mr. W—— testifies to having seen the "ball" come back, and Mr. P—— testifies to having seen me in a crystal ball before. Another strange phenomenon that has frequently been witnessed with me on occasions such as this, is an *objective* whitish vapour, which oozes out of me and partly fills the room like a mist.

Yours, etc.,

VINCENT N. TURVEY.

The reader will note that the three bodies, A, B and C, of the last experience seem to bear out the theory of the " 'I', 'Me,' and 'It' " which was submitted as a solution of the first experience.

There is little that can be said in order to make the last incident any clearer, but perhaps a few remarks may be of some use to the reader. I hope that that which is merely a question of terms may not be taken into consideration, the object being solely to explain what my *sensations* were at the time of the occurrence.

In all the previous incidents related in this chapter when the consciousness that I call "I" has been away from that which I designate "Me," the latter has remained, apparently perfectly normal and capable of no psychic action except clair-audience. That is to say, when "I" is away "Me" (or a part of "Me") could hear what "I" was saying; therefore, as no one else in the room could hear the message, that part of "Me" which heard the message must have been a psychic part (which I will designate B). So in this, and all other similar cases, "Me" is composed of a physical body and brain, which I will designate A, and a psychic body, B. But in this last case "B" was not only clair-audient but was also clair-voyant. So, in a nutshell, the difference (which, in my opinion, is a great one) between this experience and all the previous ones is that "B" could "see" as well as "hear." This

looks as if "B" would develop into another "I." If the reader admits this possibility, as I do, then there appears to be no limit to the number of bodies in which a man might function. For if "B" developed into another "I" probably another "B" would develop in "A" (the physical body) to take its place as a psychic custodian; and thus a man could have a physical body in Bournemouth, an "I" in America, another "I" in Australia, and a "B" in charge at home to receive the messages and transmit them to A (the brain). To some this may appear to be mere twaddle, but experience has taught me to believe that it is possible. It would therefore follow that "I" and "I" could control two mediums at one and the same time, and therefore, of course, a "spirit" could do likewise.